



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

274
277-2
US Doc 2.791

Committee on Un-American Activities

House

87th Congress

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------|
| 1. Testimony By and Concerning Paul Corbin | 3124 |
| 2. The Communist Party's Cold War Against Congressional Investigation of Subversion | 3125 |
| 3. Communist and Trotskyist Activity Within the Greater Los Angeles Chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee | 3126 |
| 4-5. Communist Outlets for the Distribution of Soviet Propaganda in the United States. pt.1-2 | 3127 |
| 6. Communist Youth Activities | 3128 |
| 7-8. U.S. Communist Party Assistance to Foreign Communist Governments. pt.1-2 | 3129 |
| 9. Communist Activities in the Peace Movement | 3130 |

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

(Women Strike for Peace and Certain Other Groups)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

DECEMBER 11-13, 1962

INCLUDING INDEX

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Un-American Activities



HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

MAY 10 1963

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1963

93367

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

CLYDE DOYLE, California

AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Michigan

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

DONALD C. BRUCE, Indiana

WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia

HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, Wisconsin

FRANCIS J. McNAMARA, *Director*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *General Counsel*

ALFRED M. NITTLE, *Counsel*

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|----------------------------------|------|
| Synopsis..... | 2047 |
| December 11, 1962: Testimony of— | |
| Richard A. Flink..... | 2068 |
| Blanche H. Posner..... | 2073 |
| Ruth Meyers..... | 2093 |
| Lyla Hoffman..... | 2103 |
| Afternoon session (executive): | |
| Elsie Neidenberg..... | 2114 |
| Sylvia Contente..... | 2118 |
| December 12, 1962: Testimony of— | |
| Rose Clinton..... | 2126 |
| Iris Freed..... | 2132 |
| Anna Mackenzie..... | 2138 |
| Elizabeth Moos..... | 2152 |
| Afternoon session (executive): | |
| Ceil Gross..... | 2158 |
| Jean Brancato..... | 2163 |
| Miriam Chesman..... | 2166 |
| December 13, 1962: Testimony of— | |
| William Obrinsky..... | 2178 |
| John W. Darr, Jr..... | 2182 |
| Dagmar Wilson..... | 2187 |
| Index..... | i |

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946]; 60 Stat. 812, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q)(1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * *

RULE XII

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 87TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 8, January 3, 1961

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

* * * * *

- (r) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * *

27. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

SYNOPSIS

On December 11, 12, and 13, 1962, a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held public and executive hearings in Washington, D.C., relating to the Communist Party's "united-front" tactics of infiltrating peace organizations, with particular reference to Women Strike for Peace and its Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut section.

The purposes of the hearings were to determine whether Communists are exerting influence upon the so-called "peace movement" in a manner and to a degree affecting the national security and to obtain information to aid the committee and the Congress in determining the need for amendment of the Internal Security Act of 1950 to make its provisions applicable to persons engaged in such activities, or to make unlawful membership in the Communist Party as proposed in H.R. 9944, referred to this committee on January 30, 1962.

Subcommittee Chairman Doyle, in his opening remarks, quoted recent statements of U.S. and world Communist leaders to reveal that, although they continue to believe in the eventual necessity of waging war against the free world, they have instructed party members to give top priority to agitating and propagandizing for peace in the United States and all other non-Communist nations. Specifically, he pointed out, Gus Hall, the Communist Party leader in this country, had ordered all rank-and-file members to (1) infiltrate and support existing non-Communist peace organizations, (2) create new peace groups which can be manipulated by the party, and (3) participate in all picket lines, marches, rallies, walks, and other types of demonstrations which call for peace.

Mr. Doyle reiterated that Communists, while dutifully and incessantly talking peace, actually believe there can be no real peace until they have conquered the entire world, eliminating all systems but their own. Thus, in the Communist view, peace is not a sought-after way of life, but rather a cold war weapon with which to reduce the free world's alertness in defending itself against the Moscow-directed conspiracy.

Mr. Doyle emphasized that although peace agitation and propaganda in the United States have been given top priority by Moscow, this does not mean that everyone who agitates for peace is a Communist or a fellow traveler. He pointed out that the cry for peace is universal and that it comes from sincere, patriotic persons and groups as well as from the Communists who, even while crying "peace," foment unrest and war. Mr. Doyle further cautioned that just because Communists have infiltrated some peace groups, it does not mean that all, or even a majority, of the persons in such groups are pro-Communists.

The first witness to testify in the hearings was Richard A. Flink, a New York attorney. National attention had been focused on Mr. Flink 3 months earlier, when the Department of Justice disclosed that he, with the full knowledge and approval of the Federal Bureau of In-

vestigation, had accepted a \$3,000 payment from two Russian employees of the United Nations and entered into an espionage arrangement with them. The two Russians, Yuri A. Mishukov and Yuri V. Zaitsev, had already returned to the Soviet Union at the time the Justice Department announcement was made.

Mr. Flink first met Mishukov in 1959 at a cocktail party in New York City. Mishukov was at that time a translator at the U.N. and a third secretary in the Soviet Foreign Ministry. He was later promoted to second secretary. About 2 months later, this Russian national telephoned Flink and invited him to lunch. Flink made a tentative luncheon appointment with Mishukov, but then sought advice from the U.S. Attorney's Office in New York where he had worked as a legal assistant. He was advised to contact the FBI.

The FBI asked Flink to meet Mishukov, find out what he wanted, and report back to the Bureau. This inaugurated a series of meetings between the American attorney and the Russian translator. They averaged about two encounters a month for a period of 3 years, during which time Flink kept the FBI fully informed of all developments.

"Most of these meetings," Flink told the committee, "were devoted to social, philosophical, ideological discussions."

Inasmuch as Flink was obtaining information for the FBI, he did not want to antagonize Mishukov. Therefore, he normally let the Russian bring up whatever topics he wished and then discussed them in the way he thought would please the Soviet translator. In this way, Flink testified, he and Mishukov "built up a so-called friendly relationship, predicated primarily on our mutual desire for peace."

Topics initiated by Mishukov included disarmament, the banning of nuclear testing, increased trade between the United States and Soviet-bloc nations, economics, and Flink's future. The Russian often urged his American "friend" to get into government service.

Mishukov was highly pleased in the spring of 1962 when he learned that Flink was going to be a candidate to represent the 12th District in the New York State Assembly. He offered to finance Flink's campaign, provided the latter would accept direction on what policies to advocate.

Flink objected and told Mishukov that he (Flink) would have to use his discretion in this area, inasmuch as the policy positions the Soviet representatives would want him to advocate would be "out of place" on many occasions because of the subject matter and places at which he would be delivering speeches.

In response to a question about the policies that Mishukov wanted him to advocate in public office, Flink replied that he was to talk about trade with the Soviet Union and Communist-bloc countries, disarmament, and nuclear weapons testing, and that he was to "relate whatever I was discussing to the general subject of peace."

The compromised arrangement agreed to by Flink was satisfactory to Mishukov, who gave him \$1,000 of a promised \$3,000 payment. On the occasion when Mishukov was supposed to give Flink the second payment, he informed the American that he was returning to Russia, but that Yuri Zaitsev, to whom he shortly introduced Flink, would continue the campaign arrangement then in effect.

Mishukov returned to the Soviet Union early in July 1962, and Flink continued the relationship with Zaitsev as it had been arranged by Mishukov.

Just a month after Mishukov was recalled to Russia, however, Zaitsev was also recalled. This ended Flink's contacts—and brought about the Department of Justice disclosure of their activities.

Mrs. Blanche Hofrichter Posner of Scarsdale, N.Y., a graduate of Hunter College, who had taken postgraduate work at New York University, City College, and Columbia University, was the next witness. She answered the initial routine questions asked by the committee's counsel for the purpose of establishing her identity.

Mrs. Posner admitted that she had been a teacher in the New York City public school system until 1952, but invoked the fifth amendment when asked if, as committee information indicated, she had been a member of the Communist Party teachers' fraction at the DeWitt Clinton High School where she had taught for many years.

Although Mrs. Posner declined to testify about her role in the New York group of the Women Strike for Peace, the committee's counsel placed several exhibits into the record of the hearings which indicated she held an official position in the group. An article in the *New York Times* of April 19, 1962, reporting an interview with her, described Mrs. Posner as the office coordinator for this group and stated:

She spends as many as ten hours a day working for W.S.P. Her files contain the names of 6,000 local adherents, each of whom, she said, has a list of friends she can call upon.

Literature published by the Women Strike for Peace identified the address of the New York group as 750 Third Avenue, New York City.

An undated document acquired by the committee, entitled "Structure for Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan N.Y., New Jersey, Conn.," named Mrs. Posner as the chairman pro tem of the Office Committee for the New York area. The witness invoked the fifth amendment when asked questions about this document.

Mrs. Posner also declined, on the basis of the fifth amendment, to confirm or deny committee information that she had distributed a document entitled "Bibliography" at a Women Strike for Peace meeting. This bibliography was a list of recommended reading material on the subjects of war, peace, disarmament, nuclear testing, etc. The witness also declined to say whether she had prepared the bibliography.

One source of recommended reading in the bibliography was the Greenwich Village Peace Center, headed by John W. Darr, Jr., an identified member of the Communist Party and also a witness in the present hearings. Mrs. Posner invoked the fifth amendment when asked if, when distributing the bibliography, she knew that Darr had been so identified and had informed members of the WSP of this.

She also claimed the privilege of the fifth amendment when asked if she had told WSP members that Henry Abrams, leader of another organization whose "peace" publication was included as recommended reading in the bibliography, had been publicly denounced as a veteran member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. Posner invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she was currently a member of the Communist Party; if she had worked in Women Strike for Peace upon the request of, or on orders from, the Communist Party; if any names on a list of 6,000 WSP adherents reportedly kept in her office had been received from persons known

by her to be members of the party or from any organization known to be Communist-controlled or designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States or any official agency of Government; if she had transmitted information from the WSP files to person or persons known to be members of the Communist Party; and if she had knowledge of, or belonged to, a Communist caucus within the New York organization of the WSP which met separately to coordinate Communist policies with respect to the WSP.

The next witness who appeared at the committee's public hearings on December 11 was Mrs. Ruth Meyers of Roslyn, N.Y., a graduate of Hunter College, with a master's degree in the science of education from Hofstra College. She denied that she was a member of the Women Strike for Peace on the ground that the WSP has "no membership." She refused to acknowledge whether she knew Mrs. Posner.

Mrs. Meyers admitted, however, that she was associated with a group in her neighborhood known as Women for Peace, which had acted on certain occasions under the banner of Women Strike for Peace.

The witness refused to say whether she knew Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, ostensibly the head of the national Women Strike for Peace group, but did admit that she first met with women working for peace after Mrs. Wilson's announcement of the formation, and call for support, of the national WSP.

Mrs. Meyers said that, whenever possible, her Women for Peace group tried to send representatives to county meetings of the Women Strike for Peace. (According to WSP literature, local groups were to send representatives to WSP county meetings from which delegates would be sent to meetings of the Central Coordinating Committee for the Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut area.)

Mrs. Meyers expressed pride in the work she had done to help organize a New York group of Women Strike for Peace members who took part in a picket-line demonstration at the White House on January 15, 1962. She also acknowledged that she had played a leading role in arranging a sendoff demonstration at Idlewild Airport on April 1, 1962, for the Women Strike for Peace delegation to the 17-nation disarmament conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The witness denied that she was the Ruth Meyers who, as a resident of Brooklyn on July 27, 1948, had signed a Communist Party nominating petition for an identified Communist who was seeking a seat on the New York City Council.

Mrs. Meyers invoked the fifth amendment, however, when asked if she was then, or ever had been, a member of the Communist Party and declined to state if she had engaged in activities with the Women Strike for Peace or the Women for Peace in order to carry out Communist Party directives.

The final witness at the committee's public hearings on December 11 was Mrs. Lyla Hoffman of Great Neck, N.Y., a high school graduate, who described herself as a "housewife and peace worker."

Mrs. Hoffman testified that she helped form the Great Neck Women Strike for Peace group, that she had represented that group at Nassau County meetings of WSP and, in turn, had represented Nassau County at meetings of the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York City group. She also said that she had attended several of the meetings which established the structural plan for the Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut area group of the Women Strike for Peace.

The witness testified that the Great Neck WSP maintained a mailing list of persons who attended the group's meetings and demonstrations. She said that she did not personally maintain that list; that it passed from one woman to another, according to who was available to send out the next scheduled mailing. She estimated that there were 375 names on the mailing roster.

Mrs. Hoffman refused to state whether she was acquainted with Mrs. Dagmar Wilson of Washington, D.C.

When asked if she had been a member of the Communist Party in 1944, Mrs. Hoffman replied only that she was not presently one and had not been a member for more than 5 years.

She declined to invoke the fifth amendment, but nevertheless refused to tell the committee (1) if she had ever formally resigned from the Communist Party, (2) if she had ever publicly announced withdrawal from the party, (3) if her alleged withdrawal had been purely a technical one, and (4) if she had had an understanding with any Communist Party functionary at the time of her alleged withdrawal that she would continue to support the party, its policies, and objectives.

At the conclusion of the public hearings on December 11, the committee heard two witnesses in executive session. The first witness was Mrs. Elsie Neidenberg, a high school graduate, housewife, and volunteer hospital worker of Long Island, N.Y.

Mrs. Neidenberg invoked the fifth amendment, rather than admit or deny membership in Women Strike for Peace.

According to committee information, this witness attended a meeting of the New York group of the WSP on January 22, 1962, and, with two other women, volunteered to serve as co-treasurer when the preceding treasurer resigned. When asked to confirm this information, Mrs. Neidenberg invoked the fifth amendment—as she did when queried on whether, during her tenure as co-treasurer, the New York group had filed any financial reports with the Washington headquarters of the WSP. She invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions by the committee regarding the financing of the travel of nearly 1,500 women by train from New York to Washington to participate in the White House picket line on January 15, 1962.

Mrs. Neidenberg invoked the fifth amendment to avoid confirming or denying committee information that she had signed a Communist Party independent nominating petition on August 27, 1946, for a New York State election of that year.

She also invoked the fifth amendment when asked (1) if she was currently a member of the Communist Party, (2) if, as co-treasurer of the New York WSP group, she had solicited or received funds for WSP from persons known by her to be members of the Communist Party, (3) if she had communicated information relating to the financial status of the WSP to any person known to her to be a member of the party, and (4) if she had engaged in the Women Strike for Peace activity for the benefit of the Communist Party.

The second witness heard in executive session on December 11 was Mrs. Sylvia Contente, a high school graduate and resident of the Bronx, N.Y., who testified she was president of a public school parent association, active in community affairs, and employed as a bookkeeper. Mrs. Contente invoked the fifth amendment when queried about committee information that she had attended a 1945 State convention of

the American Youth for Democracy, the 1943 successor organization of the Young Communist League. Her response was the same when presented with committee information that in 1946 she had signed a Communist Party independent nominating petition for Robert Thompson, a leading CP functionary who sought the governorship of New York State, and for other party candidates for elective public office.

Mrs. Contente invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she belonged to the New York group of WSP, if she had been a member of the WSP delegation organized by the New York group and sent to the Geneva disarmament conference, if she had personally assumed the expense of her trip to Switzerland, and if the New York group had organized the delegation to Geneva in behalf of the national Women Strike for Peace.

She also invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to say whether she was presently a member of the Communist Party or if she had been counseled by any member of the party to work in Women Strike for Peace and other peace organizations.

Miss Rose Clinton, "a free lance stenographer" of New York City, was the first witness at the committee's public hearings on December 12, 1962. She testified that she had received a bachelor of laws degree from George Washington University and that she had formerly lived in Washington, D.C.

The committee's preliminary investigation had disclosed that Miss Clinton was the secretary and membership chairman of an organization known as the West Side Peace Committee, located in New York City. Miss Clinton invoked the fifth amendment when asked how the West Side Peace Committee had come into being and the circumstances under which she had become one of its executives.

It was pointed out by the committee counsel that a U.S. Senate investigation of the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy had brought out the fact that Henry Abrams, a prominent leader of that group, was a Communist Party member of long standing. Abrams was subsequently suspended and then expelled from the national SANE organization in January 1961. The committee's counsel presented Miss Clinton with the further information that Abrams had then formed and assumed the chairmanship of a new organization called the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups, which established an executive committee to coordinate the activities of local supporting organizations.

According to the committee's information, Miss Clinton was one of the initial members of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups. She declined to affirm or deny this under the fifth amendment privilege against possible self-incrimination. She invoked the fifth amendment when asked if, as the committee's investigation had indicated, the West Side Peace Committee was one of the local groups operating in support of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups formed by Abrams.

Miss Clinton also declined, under the fifth amendment, to answer questions about the committee's investigative findings that the West Side Peace Committee had a paid-up membership of about 95 persons, a mailing list of approximately 800 names, and had a representative on the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups. She declined to say whether she either knew Henry Abrams or knew him to be a member of the Communist Party.

She invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she had been appointed secretary and membership chairman of the West Side Peace Committee by a person known to her to be a Communist Party member.

The committee counsel cited testimony before this committee on July 11, 1951, by Mrs. Mary Stalcup Markward, an undercover operative for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Communist Party of the District of Columbia from 1943 to 1949. Mrs. Markward had stated under oath that she met Rose Clinton at a secret Communist Party meeting in Baltimore during the spring of 1949. Miss Clinton declined, under the fifth amendment, to state whether Mrs. Markward's testimony concerning her was correct.

The witness also declined to affirm or deny testimony of Dorothy K. Funn given before this committee on May 4, 1953. Mrs. Funn had testified that she had known Miss Clinton as a member of the Communist Party in Washington, D.C., during the mid-1940's.

Miss Clinton continued to invoke the fifth amendment when asked (1) if she was presently a member of the Communist Party, (2) if she had participated in activities of the New York group of the Women Strike for Peace, (3) whether she was a member of the Women Strike for Peace, (4) whether she had discussed with Mrs. Blanche Posner or Mrs. Lyla Hoffman activities of the West Side Peace Committee, (5) if she had participated in making arrangements for a representative of the New York group of the WSP to speak at a fallout shelter panel discussion under the auspices of the West Side Peace Committee, as advertised in the *National Guardian* newspaper of January 15, 1962, and (6) if she had been under the discipline of the Communist Party while active with the West Side Peace Committee.

The second witness to appear at the public hearings on December 12 was Mrs. Iris Freed, a graduate of the Girls' Commercial High School, Brooklyn, and a housewife of Larchmont, N.Y.

Mrs. Freed denied that she was a delegate from Westchester County, N.Y., to the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York group of the Women Strike for Peace. She insisted that the WSP was not "organized," although she did admit a familiarity with the New York group's structural plan which provided a central coordinating committee for its jurisdiction.

The witness testified that the Women for Peace and Women Strike for Peace were one and the same organization and that she was the person who had been referred to as a Westchester community chairman of the organization called Women for Peace in the *Daily Argus* of Mount Vernon, N.Y., on January 12, 1962. Mrs. Freed denied, however, that the Westchester Women for Peace had a chairman.

Mrs. Freed admitted that on May 12, 1961, she had participated in a Carnegie Hall meeting, featuring an address by Linus Pauling, which was sponsored by the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups. She invoked the fifth amendment, however, when asked if she knew Henry Abrams, the group's chairman.

Early in her testimony, Mrs. Freed had acknowledged that her maiden name was Iris Schwartz and that she had lived at 659 Pennsylvania Avenue in Brooklyn, N.Y., in the 1940's. Nevertheless, she invoked constitutional privilege in declining to say whether she was the person of that name who had, while living at the same address, on September 15, 1941, signed a Communist Party nominating petition in behalf of well-known Communist Party functionaries.

Mrs. Freed declined, under the fifth amendment, to affirm or deny committee information that she had been a member of the Communist Party Carpet Shop Branch of Yonkers, N.Y., and that meetings of that branch had been held in her home in 1954. She claimed constitutional privilege in declining to affirm or deny committee information that she had attended a Westchester County convention of the Communist Party in January 1957. She also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she was currently a member of the Communist Party.

Another witness who appeared at the committee's public hearings on December 12 was Mrs. Anna Mackenzie of Westport, Conn., a graduate of Vassar College.

Mrs. Mackenzie testified that she was proud to have worked in the Women Strike for Peace movement but insisted that the WSP was not "an organization" and that she was therefore not a "member" of it.

The committee's investigation had disclosed that this witness had been in charge of publicity for the sendoff demonstration for the Women Strike for Peace delegation to the April 1962, 17-nation disarmament convention at Geneva. Mrs. Mackenzie claimed all constitutional privileges, excluding the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment, in refusing to say whether she had written or disseminated three items of WSP publicity which were entered into the record of the hearings.

The witness repeatedly said that she was excluding the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment, while claiming other constitutional protections as her basis for not answering questions about her role in WSP publicity.

Mrs. Mackenzie was confronted with information regarding her Communist Party membership during the 1940's, but continued to exclude the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment and refused to state whether she had ever been, or was currently, a member of the Communist Party.

Miss Elizabeth Moos of New York City, holder of an A.B. degree from Smith College and an M.A. degree from Columbia University, also appeared before the committee during its public hearings on December 12. She testified that she had attended meetings of the Metropolitan branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, but denied that she had been a leader of the group.

She acknowledged that she had been director of the Peace Information Center for a brief period when it existed 12 years earlier. This organization was officially cited by this committee in 1951 as having been under the directorship of "Elizabeth Moos, an identified Communist," and by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1956 as a Communist front. It had assumed as its principal task the circulation of the World Peace Appeal, also known as the Stockholm Peace Appeal, which was issued in March 1950 by the Communist-controlled Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at a meeting in Stockholm, Sweden, just 3 months before the Communist attack on South Korea.

Miss Moos admitted having attended the World Peace Congress held in Paris in April 1949 and cited as Communist by this committee in 1949 and by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1956.

The committee counsel cited the fact that, as a result of the World Peace Congress of April 1949, a gathering known as the American

Continental Congress for Peace was organized in the Western Hemisphere. The counsel introduced as an exhibit a *Call to the American Continental Congress for Peace* to be held in Mexico City, September 5-10, 1949. The name of Elizabeth Moos appeared with others on the *Call* under the heading of "Women's Sponsoring Committee from the United States." The witness invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she was, in fact, the Elizabeth Moos whose name was so listed on that exhibit.

It was pointed out by the committee counsel that in April 1951 the Committee on Un-American Activities published a *Report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive*, in which the American Continental Congress for Peace was officially cited as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

Miss Moos again invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to state whether, in 1953, she had written an article for the *Friendship Book* published by the American Russian Institute of San Francisco, an organization cited as subversive by the Attorney General in 1948.

She made a fifth amendment declination rather than say if there was any inaccuracy in the testimony of William W. Remington when, before a Senate subcommittee on January 30, 1948, he identified Elizabeth Moos as his mother-in-law and as a Communist.

Miss Moos also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she wished to correct information given this committee at a hearing on July 6, 1953, by former FBI undercover operative Herbert A. Philbrick, who said he had at one time been assigned by the Communist Party to work with Miss Moos on a Communist Party project in Boston.

The witness testified that she had participated in demonstrations conducted by the New York group of the Women Strike for Peace, but she declined, under the fifth amendment, to say if such participation had been the result of Communist Party directives. She also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she was currently a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. Ceil Gross, of New York City, appeared before an executive session of the committee on December 12, 1962. She stated that she was employed as a production assistant in the printing industry.

The committee counsel introduced as an exhibit an advertisement from the *New York Times* of August 29, 1961, which featured the following message: "West German Rearmament—with nuclear weapons—Is the Main Issue in Berlin." This ad proclaimed that it was a statement of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups and identified Ceil Gross as the secretary of that organization.

Mrs. Gross invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she was the same person whose name had been listed in the advertisement as the secretary of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups. She similarly declined to answer numerous other questions about this ad, as well as questions pertaining to another advertisement in the *New York Times* of May 10, 1961, which announced that Linus Pauling would be the featured speaker at a Carnegie Hall meeting on May 12, 1961. This meeting, called "Rally for Peace—To Stop the Spread of Nuclear Weapons," was also sponsored by the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups, which had placed the ad for it in the *New York Times*.

Mrs. Gross invoked the fifth amendment rather than affirm or deny the committee's information that she was cochairman of the West Side Peace Committee and that her home address had also been designated as the official mailing address of the West Side Peace Committee.

She also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she knew Rose Clinton, if she knew Miss Clinton to be a member of the Communist Party, if she knew Henry Abrams or knew him as a member of the Communist Party, if she herself was then a member of the Communist Party, and whether she had participated in activities of the Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. Jean Brancato, a graduate of the Omaha Technical High School, who had attended the New Haven State Teachers College for one year and is a housewife of the Bronx, N.Y., appeared before the executive session of the committee on December 12, 1962.

The witness denied that she had held office as a Bronx representative on the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York group of the WSP, though committee investigation indicated she had. She also refused, under the fifth amendment privilege, to answer a series of questions about the organization and function of the Central Coordinating Committee. Mrs. Brancato also invoked the fifth amendment when queried as to whether she had been active with the New York group of WSP.

She likewise declined to affirm or deny that she had circulated and signed a nominating petition in 1949 for Benjamin J. Davis, Communist Party candidate for councilman in the city of New York. When presented a photostatic copy of the petition bearing the signature of "Jeanne" Brancato, she again relied upon the fifth amendment in refusing to affirm or deny that it was her signature.

She also invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she had been a member of the Communist Party in 1954 and if she was currently a Communist Party member.

Another witness who appeared at the committee's December 12 executive hearings was Mrs. Miriam Chesman, a graduate of Hunter College and housewife of the Bronx, N.Y.

The committee's investigation had indicated that Mrs. Chesman was a Bronx delegate to the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. She acknowledged that she had attended some meetings of the Central Coordinating Committee, but denied that she was an official delegate to them because, she said, "there are no such things." She denied that she had helped in the preparation of the structural plan for the New York group of the WSP.

The witness invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she knew Mrs. Jean Brancato.

The committee's counsel introduced photostatic copies of nominating petitions for known Communist candidates for public office in New York during the election years of 1946, 1951, and 1954. Each of these petitions contained the signature of a Miriam Chesman and an address which corresponded to Mrs. Chesman's admitted current and former residences.

The witness invoked the fifth amendment and refused to affirm or deny that she was the Miriam Chesman who had signed the petitions. She also invoked the fifth amendment and refused to say whether she was a member of the Communist Party at the time or times any or all of the petitions were executed.

Mrs. Chesman again exercised her fifth amendment privilege when asked if she had at any time served as subscription clerk or staff member of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The committee counsel pointed out for the record that the American Council of the IPR had been thoroughly investigated by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, whose report of July 2, 1952, declared that the U.S. Communist Party and Soviet officials considered that organization to be "an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence." The record of that Senate hearing revealed that a Miriam Chesman was a staff member of the American Council for the Institute of Pacific Relations during 1944, 1945, and 1946.

The witness invoked the fifth amendment when asked if she had been a Communist Party member while serving as a subscription clerk for the American Council of the IPR.

The witness also invoked the fifth amendment in response to questions relating to current membership in the Communist Party and when asked if she had engaged in Women Strike for Peace activities in response to Communist Party directives, or if she had ever received financial support from the Communist Party for the purpose of promoting the Women Strike for Peace.

The first witness at the committee's public hearings on December 13 was Dr. William Obrinsky of Staten Island, N.Y. After identifying himself by name, current address, and as a practicing physician, Dr. Obrinsky then invoked the fifth amendment to all questions, including those pertaining to his place of birth, former residence, and his education.

The witness, under the fifth amendment, declined to say if he had organized the Staten Island Community Peace Group early in 1961. He chose, in similar manner, not to reveal if he had made available to the press information about that group which appeared in the *Staten Island Advance* of March 6 and 15, 1961. These news accounts reported plans by the Staten Island Community Peace Group for a public showing of an anti-war film titled "Grand Illusion" and the circulation of a petition against nuclear weapons for NATO intended for presentation at the Oslo, Norway, meeting of the NATO powers on April 15, 1961.

Dr. Obrinsky declined, under the privilege of the fifth amendment, to provide any information about the office location, the organizational structure, or the membership of the Staten Island Community Peace Group.

He also invoked the fifth amendment, rather than confirm or deny that he had formerly been chairman of the Staten Island chapter of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and that, following the expulsion of Henry Abrams and other Communists by the national SANE group, he had terminated his membership in SANE and formed the Staten Island Community Peace Group.

The committee counsel cited hearings conducted by this committee on February 17, 1957, during which Dr. William Sorum testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1945 to 1952 and, in addition, a member of the State Committee of the Communist Party of Louisiana during the years 1946 and 1947. Dr. Sorum had also testified under oath that during the course of his party membership he had been assigned to the Professional Branch of the Commu-

nist Party in New Orleans and that William Obrinsky was also a member of that branch.

Dr. Obrinsky invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he had known Dr. Sorum, if he (the witness) had resided in New Orleans, if he had belonged to the Professional Branch of the Communist Party in New Orleans, and if he was currently a member of the Communist Party.

The witness was handed a news item from the *Staten Island Advance* of December 20, 1961, reporting a public debate on civil defense in which he had participated and had strongly opposed the creation of a bomb or fallout shelter program. The witness declined to inform the committee how he had secured a place on the panel of debaters, whether he had done so upon instructions from anyone known to him to be in a position of leadership in the Communist Party, or whether he had done so in response to Communist Party directives to infiltrate the peace movement.

Dr. Obrinsky continued to exercise his privilege under the fifth amendment by refusing to say if he had been under the discipline of the Communist Party while chairman of the Staten Island SANE group, while an organizer or member of the Staten Island Community Peace Group, or while a public debater against a civil defense bomb shelter program.

John W. Darr, Jr., of New York City, was also a witness at the committee's public hearings on December 13, 1962. He was responsive to the committee counsel's request that he state his name and address, but then declared that he would not cooperate further. He also declared that he would not invoke the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment as the reason for not cooperating.

Mr. Darr not only refused to answer questions pertaining to his chairmanship of the board of directors of the Greenwich Village Peace Center, located at 133 West Third Street, New York City, but also refused to examine a letterhead of that organization introduced by the committee counsel on which the name "John Darr" was so identified.

The witness thereafter refused to answer a series of questions put to him about his role in, and the activities of, the Greenwich Village Peace Center. In addition to refusing to answer the questions asked by the committee counsel, Mr. Darr refused to respond to the subcommittee chairman's direction that a number of them be answered.

Other refusals by Mr. Darr were in relation to queries about whether he had participated in the formation of the Greenwich Village Peace Center in response to Communist directives and whether he was currently a member of the Communist Party.

The committee counsel cited for the record the 1956 Report and Order of the Subversive Activities Control Board following its hearings in proceedings under the Internal Security Act of 1950 in the case of *Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States v. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.* This SACB report declared that Mr. Darr had been identified as having been a member of the Communist Party while serving on the board of directors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., an organization which the SACB, as a result of its hearings, found to be a Communist front and accordingly ordered to register as such with the Attorney General.

The witness refused to answer—and refused the chairman's direction to answer—when asked whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

The final witness at the committee's public hearings on December 13, 1962, was Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, of Washington, D.C., a graduate of a high school in London, England, trained in the Art Department of London University, which she attended for 4 years, and now generally recognized as the leader of the Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. Wilson disclaimed the role of being the official leader of the group, but testified that it was her initiative which started the movement. She said that she considered the recognition of herself as the leader of the WSP to be more honorary than official.

The witness testified that "nobody is controlled by anybody" in Women Strike for Peace, but said that there was constant communication among the participants.

Mrs. Wilson told the committee that, although some individual groups in different localities preferred to use a different name, the generally accepted name for the national movement had been Women Strike for Peace. She said further that the group subsequently decided to communicate with peace organizations in other nations and, as a result, on January 15, 1962, changed its name to Women's International Strike for Peace (WISP). She testified that she could not recall specifically at whose suggestion the name had been changed, but she said she was "pretty sure" that it had not been the recommendation of any member of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace.

The committee counsel then produced information that, a few days prior to January 15, 1962, a number of cablegrams had been sent from foreign countries addressed to the "Women's International Strike for Peace" at the New York City address. Mrs. Wilson was asked why cablegrams were designated for the Women's International Strike for Peace and sent to a New York address prior to the time that "International" was supposed to have been inserted in the movement's name by its leadership or coordinators in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Wilson responded that a woman who resided in New York had volunteered to make contact with women in other countries, and that that woman's address was therefore the one to which the cabled replies were sent.

The committee counsel informed Mrs. Wilson—who claimed not to know—that committee investigation showed that the woman who had made the contacts and received the cables from women in foreign countries was also a member of the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York group of the WSP. Counsel also informed Mrs. Wilson that the chairman of one of WISP's work committees, the International Committee, was also a member of the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York group.

In view of this information, the witness agreed with the committee counsel that the international contacts made by WISP rested in the hands of the New York group of the movement, rather than with the Washington group.

When asked if it was not a fact that she did not really exercise effective leadership or control over the New York group, Mrs. Wilson replied: "I think I already explained that. I mean we all act on our own."

She would not say, in response to counsel's question, that the New York group had played the dominant role in activities of the Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. Wilson said that she could not recall precisely whether the WISP picket demonstration at the White House on January 15, 1962, had been her idea or someone else's. She testified that she was not sure whether it had been she who called for a WISP demonstration at the United Nations on February 20, 1962 (which was held to protest President Kennedy's decision to resume nuclear testing after the Soviet Union had violated the nuclear weapons test ban).

The witness conceded that the idea of sending 51 WISP delegates to the Geneva disarmament conference in April 1962 had originated from within the New York group.

The witness said that she had no part in drawing up the proposed structural plan for the New York group of WSP which had been entered as an exhibit when Mrs. Posner was a witness before the committee on December 11. Mrs. Wilson admitted having discussed with persons in the New York group the structural plan actually adopted by the Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, which was also introduced as an exhibit during the testimony of Mrs. Posner. The testimony of Mrs. Wilson on this subject, however, did little to indicate that she had exerted any degree of influence over the structure of the New York group of WSP.

Mrs. Wilson told the committee that she had participated in the February 20, 1962, anti-U.S. nuclear test demonstration at the United Nations as a result of an invitation to do so from the New York group of the WSP. She said that neither prior nor subsequent to that date had she ever exercised any control over the activities of the New York group.

The committee counsel introduced a copy of the March 28, 1962, Moscow-published *New Times*, which stated that the Women's International Democratic Federation was sponsoring a Women's World Assembly for Disarmament (March 23-25, 1962) in Vienna, Austria. The article further stated that the Women's International Democratic Federation (which has been cited by this committee as an international Communist front) had established contact with the Women Strike for Peace in the United States about participating in the Assembly.

Mrs. Wilson denied that she had been in personal contact with the WIDF on the matter of the Disarmament Assembly. She said that she thought WIDF had initiated the contact between itself and the Women Strike for Peace. The witness testified that the WSP person who was the actual contact with the Moscow-based women's group might have been WSP's international coordinator, who lived in New York and was a member of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace.

The witness told the committee that the first national demonstrations by Women Strike for Peace had been staged in 60 cities throughout the country on November 1, 1961. She claimed that they occurred as a result of her initiative, although she would not affirm or deny having been the coordinator of them.

Mrs. Wilson acknowledged that in June 1962 she had attended a national conference of Women Strike for Peace hosted by an Ann Arbor, Mich., group of WSP. She said the idea of holding such a conference had originated with that group. She initially denied that it had been a political conference, although, as committee counsel

pointed out, the September 15, 1962, edition of the *People's World*, West Coast Communist newspaper, had reported:

At their first national conference last June at Ann Arbor, Mich., Women for Peace (in some cities called Women's Strike for Peace, also Women's Intl. Strike for Peace) discussed at some length the question of political action.

The article from which the above has been excerpted was authored by Peggy Dennis, wife of the late Eugene Dennis, who, prior to his death in January 1961, was general secretary of the Communist Party of the USA.

The committee counsel cited another paragraph from the same article in *People's World*, which stated:

A grass roots, votes-for-peace activity by many hundreds of women in Pacific Coast states has added a new dimension to congressional and state election campaigns, which go into high gear in the remaining seven weeks before Nov. 6.

Mrs. Wilson, who had denied that the Ann Arbor conference had been a political meeting, testified that political activity described as having taken place on the West Coast was actually conceived by the Washington office of the Women Strike for Peace. She subsequently acknowledged, too, that political activity may have come up for discussion at Ann Arbor.

On the question of WSP political activity, it is interesting to note that Mr. Flink testified that, during his campaign for a seat in the State Assembly of New York, he was contacted by a representative of Women Strike for Peace who gave him some of its literature and asked him questions about disarmament, the conversion of presently operated military plants to peacetime use, and other related issues.

Committee counsel asked Mrs. Wilson if she had at any time consulted with Blanche Posner, Ruth Meyers, Lyla Hoffman, Iris Freed, or Anna Mackenzie with the view of directing the activities of the New York group of the Women Strike for Peace.

The witness responded that she had never exercised direction or control, that she had only made suggestions.

Committee counsel informed Mrs. Wilson the committee had obtained information that Selma Rein had participated in past activities of the Washington group of Women Strike for Peace, that Mrs. Rein had had possession of a key to the Washington office of the WSP, and that in March 1962 Mrs. Rein was appointed to a committee of four members who were to arrange a list of international contacts to be made by Women Strike for Peace. Counsel asked Mrs. Wilson specifically if Mrs. Rein had made contact with the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF) in Moscow in behalf of Women Strike for Peace.

Although she had readily responded to questions about individual WSP participants up to this point, Mrs. Wilson, when asked about Mrs. Rein, indignantly said that she did not think she could be expected to give the names of persons who have participated in the Women Strike for Peace. She said Mrs. Rein could not have been the person who made contact with the WIDF because contact between WIDF and WSP had been made prior to March 1962. She said that Mrs. Rein could not have been appointed to a four-member

committee because "No one has ever been appointed to anything" in Women Strike for Peace. People do volunteer for jobs, she added.

The witness said that she did not have any knowledge that Mrs. Rein had served as a volunteer on a committee to make a list of international contacts for WSP.

Mrs. Wilson testified that she had no knowledge that Mrs. Selma Rein had been identified as a member of the Communist Party.

Committee counsel informed her that Mrs. Rein had been so identified before this committee on December 13, 1955, by a former member of the Communist Party. When subpoenaed to appear before the committee on February 28, 1956, to explain or deny her alleged membership in the Communist Party, Mrs. Rein invoked the fifth amendment.

Near the conclusion of her testimony, Mrs. Wilson was asked if she would knowingly permit or encourage a Communist Party member to occupy a leadership position in Women Strike for Peace. She replied:

Well, my dear sir, I have absolutely no way of controlling, do not desire to control, who wishes to join in the demonstrations and the efforts that the women strikers have made for peace.

She was then asked if she would knowingly permit or welcome Nazis or Fascists to occupy leadership positions in Women Strike for Peace. She said:

Whether we could get them or not, I don't think we could.¹

The committee counsel's final question to Mrs. Wilson—and her reply—were as follows:

COUNSEL. Am I correct, then, in assuming that you plan to take no action designed to prevent Communists from assuming positions of leadership in the movement or to eliminate Communists who may have already obtained such positions?

Mrs. WILSON. Certainly not.

¹ Despite the fact that this is the response recorded by the official reporter for the hearings, newspapermen covering the hearings reported—and members of the committee and its staff distinctly recall—that Mrs. Wilson's actual reply to the preceding question was: "If only we could get them on our side!"

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT (Women Strike for Peace and Certain Other Groups)

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1962

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D.C.
PUBLIC HEARINGS

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in the Caucus Room, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Subcommittee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle, of California, and William M. Tuck, of Virginia.

Staff members present: Francis J. McNamara, director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Raymond T. Collins, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. The subcommittee will please come to order.

In view of the crowded condition of the hearing room, I know we will all cooperate and accommodate ourselves to that fact in order that the committee may proceed promptly in performance of its duties. We are asking the utmost cooperation of everyone in the hearing room; I am sure we will have it.

In the absence of having it, of course, the committee will have to exercise its prerogative and obligation to see that the committee is not interrupted in any manner in its official obligations.

Are you ready, Counsel?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you ready, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I might announce that today the subcommittee will consist of myself, Congressman Doyle of California, and William Tuck of Virginia, formerly the distinguished Governor of that wonderful State. Mr. Bruce, the other member of the subcommittee, is not present this morning but will be in the afternoon.

Two of the three designated members of the subcommittee are present so there is a quorum, and we will proceed.

Before we hear the first witness, I have a prepared statement I wish to read, which will give to everyone in the hearing room an outline of what the objectives of these hearings today are:

Everyone in the world, every nation in the world—if you can believe their words—wants peace. The cry is universal. It comes from neutralists, from Communists, from anti-Communists. Yet there is

no peace because certain persons, groups, and nations in the world—even while they cry peace—foment war and unrest. They plot and carry out military attacks on neutralist India, on anti-Communist South Vietnam. They plot sabotage in the United States. They dynamite electric power stations in Venezuela. In every nation, in small and in big ways, they disrupt peace or make it impossible of attainment.

There is good reason, unfortunately, to doubt Communist claims that they desire peace, as others understand the term. Late in 1948, Stalin launched a spectacular "peace" offensive. It was marked in major nations of the world by so-called "peace" conferences and congresses, which were supported and attended by the cream of the Communist and fellow-traveling intellectual crop in those nations. A Moscow-directed World Peace Council, still operating in Vienna, was born of these gatherings. In June 1950, however, even as Stalin was directing the creation of this so-called World Peace Council (which was formally established about 5 months later), he launched a military attack on South Korea. That attack marked the beginning of 3 years' undeclared war between the forces of communism and freedom. Over 33,000 Americans were killed in battle in that Communist "peace" action. More than 123,000 other Americans were casualties of it—20,000 of them also losing their lives.

These facts alone indicate that we must give careful consideration to just what the word "peace" means to Communists. Studying what they say about war will help us determine what they mean by peace.

A pamphlet on basic Communist doctrine prepared by the National Education Department of the U.S. Communist Party and sold in Communist Party bookstores in the United States at the very time Stalin's "peace" offensive was at its peak—and during the Korean conflict—made the following doctrinal statement:

Wars do not occur through accidents of history or the mistakes of statesmen. They are the inevitable result of capitalism and its contradictions.

Volume 8 of the *Large Soviet Encyclopedia (Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya)*, published in 1951, defines war as follows (p. 570):

War is a social phenomenon inherent in a society containing classes and antagonism.

Two pages later, in its discussion of war, the *Encyclopedia* states:

Wars will cease only with the destruction of capitalism and the victory of the socialist system in all the world.

Again, the *Small Soviet Encyclopedia (Malaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya)*, third edition, volume 2, published in 1958, states:

The basic cause for contemporary wars is the capitalist economic system and the irreconcilable internal contradictions in it.

In other words, according to fundamental Communist doctrine, there will be wars—there can be no real peace—as long as capitalism exists. To end wars, to achieve peace, capitalism must be destroyed, according to the Communists.

According to their own words, Communists believe that there can be no real peace until they have conquered the world, eliminating all other systems. They say to one another, and to those who will make an effort to study their doctrine, that they really do not believe in peace in our time.

Why, then, do they talk of peace?

Because it serves Communist interests in two ways:

1. The initiated Communist, understanding his Marxist-Leninist doctrine, knows that a Moscow call to intensify the "fight for peace" means that he should intensify his fight to destroy capitalism and its major bastion, the United States of America. This is the way to peace—according to his Communist doctrine. Thus, Communist peace propaganda is a call to action for all Communists, spurring them to increased activity and effort aimed at achieving the Communist goal of world conquest—by war or any other means.

2. As events have proved, peace propaganda and agitation have a disarming, mollifying, confusing, and weakening effect on those nations which are the intended victims of communism. Moreover, throughout history, aggressors, dictators, and governments bent on conquering others, or the whole world, have known that pacifism or an unrealistic and exaggerated desire for peace on the part of their intended victims is a tremendous asset to ultimate victory for the aggressor. Excessive concern with peace on the part of any nation impedes or prevents adequate defense preparation, hinders effective diplomacy in the national interest, undermines the will to resist and saps national strength. For this reason, in today's world, intense peace propaganda and agitation in non-Communist nations obviously serve the aggressive plans of world communism.

In 1917, Lenin wrote:

We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars for the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always declared it to be absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to renounce revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of socialism.

This is still Communist doctrine. It was restated in only slightly different words in a declaration unanimously adopted by 81 of the world's Communist parties which met in Moscow in November-December 1960 to devise the strategy they hope will bring them world victory.

This same unanimously adopted statement had other things to say which are vitally important to all Americans and which touch on the purpose of these hearings. I quote:

Today, as never before, it is important to fight perseveringly in all countries to make the peace movement thrive and extend to towns and villages, factories and offices.

On January 6, 1961, shortly after this meeting, Khrushchev made a major strategy speech directed to Communists in all parts of the world. He said, in part:

Every day bigger sections of the population should be drawn into the struggle for peace * * *. The banner of peace enables us to rally the masses around us. By holding aloft this banner we will be even more successful.

Following Khrushchev's cue and also the declaration of the 81 Communist parties, U.S. Communist Party leader Gus Hall, in a major report to the party's National Committee on January 20, 1961, made the following statement:

It is necessary to widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people. * * *

It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth and yes, even children—into the struggle. * * *

It is essential to give full support to the existing peace bodies, to their movements and the struggles they initiate, to building and strengthening their organizations. * * * It is also necessary to recognize the need for additional peace organizations * * *.

* * * * * *

Above all, Communists will intensify their work for peace, and their efforts to build up peace organizations.

These very blunt Communist statements make one thing very clear: Present Communist strategy gives No. 1 priority to peace agitation and propaganda in the United States and all other non-Communist nations. It calls for Communist infiltration of, and support for, existing peace organizations, Communist or non-Communist. It calls for the creation of new peace organizations, controlled or infiltrated and manipulated by Communists. It calls for assemblies, picket lines, marches, delegations, walks—every possible kind of demonstration for so-called “peace.”

Basically, it is because of the Communist directives I have just quoted that these hearings are being held. Preliminary investigation by the committee indicates that Communists in the United States, in carrying out these directives—as they would be expected to do—have both infiltrated existing peace groups and created or infiltrated newly formed organizations.

For reasons already discussed, this Communist activity intensifies the security problems faced by this Nation. This is internal psychopolitical warfare, directed by Moscow and waged within our own borders. The aim of this activity is not peace, but the undermining and sabotage of the United States.

The questions of peace, disarmament, nuclear weapons testing, and related matters are the gravest issues confronting the United States today. It is vital that the U.S. Congress be informed whether, and to what extent, concealed agents of a foreign power are attempting to influence the decisions which must be made on these questions—and to influence the decisions so they will serve not the interests of the United States of America, but a foreign power dedicated to the destruction of freedom everywhere, including the United States of America.

The subject of this inquiry is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, particularly in the Metropolitan New York area and with special reference to the Women Strike for Peace—and also to determine the degree to which Communists have responded to the previously quoted directives that they engage in such activity. Such information, as the resolution authorizing these hearings indicates, is relevant to certain legislative proposals now pending before the committee.

The committee wishes to emphasize these points before the hearings begin:

The fact that Communists are active in peace agitation does not mean that everyone who agitates for peace is a Communist or even a fellow traveler.

The fact that Communists have created and infiltrated peace organizations does not mean that all peace groups are Communist or that all members of them, or even a majority of them, are Communists, Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers.

As I stated in the opening of these remarks, the cry for peace is universal. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of many people who are today agitating and calling for peace, even though we may have reason to doubt the wisdom of some of the actions and statements made by these people.

The subject and legislative purpose of these hearings today are set forth in a resolution adopted by the committee on August 2, 1962. That resolution reads as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED, that hearings by the Committee on Un-American Activities, or a subcommittee thereof, be held in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the Chairman may determine, on such date or dates as the Chairman may designate, relating to Communist conspiratorial techniques and propaganda used in implementing Soviet and United States Communist Party directives within the United States, with special reference to the so-called united front tactics of the Communist Party, and the Communist Party tactics of infiltration of non-Communist organizations, the legislative purpose being to determine the need for amendment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, so as to make its provisions applicable to persons engaged in such activities, and for the additional legislative purpose of obtaining information designed to aid the Committee and Congress in determining whether the Internal Security Act of 1950 should be amended in a manner to make unlawful membership in the Communist Party of the United States, as proposed in H.R. 9944, referred to this Committee on the 30th day of January 1962.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that any subcommittee appointed pursuant to this resolution be authorized to hear any other matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

The order for appointment of this subcommittee, for the record, reads as follows:

NOVEMBER 9, 1962

To: Francis J. McNamara, Director
Committee on Un-American Activities

Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this Committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Honorable Clyde Doyle as Chairman, and Honorable William M. Tuck and Honorable Donald C. Bruce as associate members, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., Tuesday, December 11, 1962, at 10:00 a.m., on subjects under investigation by the Committee and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days, as it may deem necessary.

Please make this action a matter of Committee record.

If any Member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

Given under my hand this 9th day of November, 1962.

(s) Francis E. Walter
FRANCIS E. WALTER

Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

May I suggest and state this in addition to my previous words. On account of the crowded room and the fullness of the program, there is necessity for quiet and order without interruption. The committee noticed applause at one point in the statement which I read. While it was very pleasant to hear that applause, of course we must ask that there be no applause for, or demonstration against, anything that is said in this room today. If there is any such disturbance, I will ask the marshals to remove that person or those persons from the hearing room instantly. In other words, I will not have time for, nor take time to give, any more warnings. This is it. The committee is too busy to waste time warning people to behave themselves in a public hearing. So, take notice, please. I know we will have your utmost cooperation. Thank you very much.

Counsel, if you will, proceed and call your first witness.

Mr. NITTLE. Richard A. Flink, come forward, please.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Richard Flink, will you please rise and be sworn? Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. FLINK. I do.

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD A. FLINK

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mr. FLINK. Richard A. Flink, 155-24 84th Street, Howard Beach 14, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Mr. FLINK. March 1, 1935, in New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education and training?

Mr. FLINK. I graduated from Stuyvesant High School in New York City in 1951, from Brandeis University in 1955. I took postgraduate work during 1955-56, graduated from New York University Law School in 1959, received my master of laws degree from New York University Law School in 1962.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation, Mr. Flink?

Mr. FLINK. I am an attorney, a member of the New York bar.

Mr. NITTLE. Last September, the Attorney General issued an announcement concerning the attempted enlistment by two Soviet employees of the United Nations of one Richard A. Flink in a Soviet intelligence or espionage apparatus. This was widely reported in the press.

You are the Richard A. Flink to whom the Attorney General referred, are you not?

Mr. FLINK. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. When you were first contacted by a Soviet agent in 1959, according to reports, did you not, as a loyal and patriotic citizen, report the incident to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and thereafter cooperate fully with your Government in this experience?

Mr. FLINK. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Flink, the committee realizes from prior contact with you that you possess considerable information of interest to it and the American people concerning Soviet espionage tactics. That account, however, is not directly related to this inquiry, and we will not pursue the matter in any detail now.

But you did learn from Soviet agents Mishukov and Zaitsev other things that are pertinent to this hearing, and it is about these matters that we would like to receive your testimony.

Will you tell us when you were first approached by Soviet agent Yuri A. Mishukov?

Mr. FLINK. I was first approached during the summer of 1959, subsequent to a meeting with two other Soviets, which was a casual meeting resulting in an invitation to visit the Soviet Trade Fair which was taking place in New York City at that time, and subsequently met with Mishukov at a cocktail party in New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Did Mishukov continue his contacts with you, after that first meeting at a cocktail party in New York City?

Mr. FLINK. Yes, sir. About a month and a half or 2 months later, I was contacted by phone by Mishukov, who asked me if I would care to have lunch with him.

At that time I didn't exactly want to meet Mishukov, although I didn't want to be discourteous, and so I set a tentative appointment with him and I went down to see somebody whom I know at the U.S. attorney's office where I had worked.

In a conversation with the U.S. attorney, I then called the Bureau, which asked me if I would meet with Mishukov, see what he wanted, and report back to them, which I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you tell us about the subsequent contacts with Mishukov?

Mr. FLINK. During the succeeding 3 years, I meet with Mishukov on various occasions. Our meetings were usually held—although there were times when there were breaks—on an average of twice a month. Most of these meetings were devoted to social, philosophical, ideological discussions.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, would you tell us in substance what those discussions were?

Mr. FLINK. Primarily, Mishukov and myself built up a so-called friendly relationship, predicated primarily on our mutual desire for peace.

At the time when I first met Mishukov, he was married, as he told me, and had a young child, and his greatest desire was that we have peace in the world. I agreed with him, and our relationship then built up from there.

Primarily, our initial discussions dealt with my attitude towards the Soviet people, towards the Soviet Union, towards Premier Khrushchev's good-will tour in the United States.

As it developed, we went from the realm of ideology, as we had been discussing communism, Marxism, Leninism, we then proceeded on to topics of more current interest, such as disarmament, increased trade, and areas related to these fields.

Mr. NITTLE. During the course of your discussions on the subject of disarmament and related fields, what did Mishukov tell you?

Mr. FLINK. Well, basically, my relationship with Mishukov was a very frustrating one. I was in a position where I had to listen and not antagonize Mishukov or seem as if I was probing for answers, and Mishukov seemed to always bring the discussion around to topics such as disarmament. When we would discuss disarmament, Mishukov's primary feeling on this subject was that the United States did not genuinely want disarmament, that disarmament was only an interest of the Soviet Union, and his reasons for stating this were as follows:

Disarmament, in Mishukov's view, could only be achieved where a planned economy was present. The Soviet Union had a planned economy and, therefore, by government planning of the means of production, disarmament could be achieved at any time.

The United States, in Mishukov's view, did not genuinely want disarmament, because disarmament could not be achieved under our system, primarily because we did not have government planning, and disarmament would, therefore, be left in the hands of private industrialists who could or could not, at their own will, choose to disarm or choose to continue with peaceful production.

Mishukov, likewise, was of the opinion that the industrialists were pushing the Government to continue munitions contracts, military contracts, and that it was in the interest of both the Government and

the industrialists that our war economy or artificial economy, as he called it, would continue.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you discuss specifically the subject of nuclear testing?

Mr. FLINK. Yes, we had several discussions on nuclear testing. They started around the time in which the Soviet Union resumed nuclear testing and then the United States resumed nuclear testing.

It was Mishukov's position that the resumption of nuclear testing by the United States was an irresponsible act and that it could only lead to war. It was Mishukov's view on this subject that the resumption of nuclear testing was an irresponsible act on the part of the President of the United States.

In one of our conversations, Mishukov specifically stated that at one time he disliked President Eisenhower very much but, compared to Kennedy, Eisenhower was a god. He thought that Kennedy was too young and too irresponsible and that his acts would only, if they continued, result in a world war.

Mr. NITTLE. I might point out, Mr. Flink, that the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, in a speech to the General Assembly on September 20, 1962, said:

Since the U.S.S.R. broke the moratorium last fall, its explosions have yielded two hundred megatons. Those which the United States was then compelled to undertake have yielded twenty-five megatons. I repeat, that we in this country want to cease testing of nuclear weapons.

Did you have any discussion with respect to the comparative efforts and the fact that the United States resumed testing only after Soviet Russia had broken the moratorium?

Mr. FLINK. No, sir. I was unable to ever draw Mishukov into a discussion of the comparative policies of the United States and the Soviet Union for two reasons: One, Mishukov always dominated the conversations; and, secondly, I didn't want to, or I couldn't, under our relationship, antagonize Mishukov.

Therefore, I usually discussed the topics which Mishukov brought up in the manner in which Mishukov wanted them discussed.

Mr. NITTLE. The press accounts indicate that Yuri Mishukov was employed as a Soviet translator in the United Nations' Office of Conference Services.

Was that the position ostensibly held by him at the time of your meetings with him?

Mr. FLINK. Mishukov had two roles. He was a translator with the United Nations and held the grade of P-4. He was also a second secretary in the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

Mr. NITTLE. How did you acquire the information that he was the second secretary of the Soviet Foreign Ministry in addition to his employment as a translator in the United Nations?

Mr. FLINK. Primarily through discussions with Mishukov.

Mishukov originally was, I think, a P-3 and a third secretary. When he was promoted to the rank of P-4, he was very happy on one occasion and, during the conversations, told me that he had just received a promotion from a third secretary to a second secretary in the Foreign Ministry.

Mr. NITTLE. I believe Mishukov was recalled and left the United States on or about July 5, 1962. Did he make any arrangements for you to meet a replacement of his?

Mr. FLINK. Yes. During the end of June, the beginning of July, Mishukov and I had already consummated our deal with respect to the Foreign Ministry financing my campaign for election to the New York State Assembly. Mishukov had given me \$1,000 of the proposed initial \$3,000.

At our second meeting, at which Mishukov was to give me the second payment, he informed me that he was going back to Russia and that during the time that he would be away—and he hoped at that time that he would be able to come back—my relationship and transactions, as they were, were to be continued by Yuri Zaitsev.

About an hour after the conversation, he told me that Zaitsev was coming to this meeting, and Zaitsev subsequently showed up and we were introduced.

It was at that point that Zaitsev continued Mishukov's relationship.

Mr. NITTLE. You were a candidate to represent the 12th District in the New York Assembly in 1962, is that correct?

Mr. FLINK. That is correct.

Mr. NITTLE. How did Mishukov react to your candidacy for office?

Mr. FLINK. Mishukov was pleased that I was going to get the nomination. Throughout our entire relationship he had tried to influence me in discussions to seek some sort of Government employment.

When I first met Mishukov, or in one of our initial conversations, I purposely mentioned the fact that I was at one time a student assistant United States attorney in the Southern District of New York. It was in subsequent conversations brought out that I was thinking of going back to work for the Government. Mishukov picked it up from there and continued to bring up the subject of my interest in Government work.

So 3 years later, as it turned out, when I received the nomination for Assembly, Mishukov was extremely happy about it.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he indicate to you what policies he expected you to advocate or to follow in public office in exchange for his offer to finance your campaign?

Mr. FLINK. Prior to the consummation of the \$3,000 deal, we had a discussion as to what policies I could advocate and how they would be advocated. This discussion centered around the fact that Mishukov wanted me to mouth lines which he or somebody else would tell me.

I had to object very strongly to this suggestion because I told him that it might be out of place; that the platforms from which I might be able to speak would primarily be civic associations, the floor of the legislature if I was elected, or similar gatherings; and that I could not, at his direction, merely spout whatever line I was told to; that, therefore, whatever had to be said I would have to say just at my discretion, which he agreed to.

He was recalled shortly thereafter.

However, during the campaign I was told that if I got the opportunity, I should try and discuss such issues as increased trade with

the Soviet-bloc countries, increased trade with the Soviet Union, and generally relate whatever I was discussing to the general subject of peace. This would, therefore, likewise bring in the subjects of disarmament, nuclear testing, and the like.

Mr. NITTLE. In the course of your candidacy, were you contacted by pressure groups or representatives of pressure groups?

Mr. FLINK. Yes, I was, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you contacted by any representatives of the peace movement?

Mr. FLINK. I was. I was contacted by the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and by the Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you describe the circumstances under which you met with a representative or representatives of Women Strike for Peace?

Mr. FLINK. During the month of October, the candidate who was running for the State senate on the same ticket I was and I, both received an invitation to be interviewed by the local representatives of the Women Strike for Peace.

We arranged an appointment at my running mate's house, which was held during one evening. I don't recall the date at this point, but at that time, the representative of Women Strike for Peace and two other women came to my running mate's house, and we then proceeded to be interviewed.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you tell us what was said during the course of that interview?

Mr. FLINK. The women asked us whether or not we were familiar with the Women Strike for Peace, and we told them we had heard the name, had seen some of their literature.

They then proceeded to show us other literature and ask us questions which primarily dealt with the subjects of disarmament, the conversion of presently operated military plants to peacetime use, the proposal for the introduction of legislation to set up an economic committee within the State to study the problems associated with disarmament—unemployment, for instance, retooling—so that in the event disarmament was achieved we would then be able to disarm or change over our economy with a minimum of confusion and unemployment.

It should be noted that at the time I was interviewed by the Women Strike for Peace I was a candidate for public office. It is my understanding that this group indiscriminately held interviews of all candidates in their respective areas. I attach no especial significance to the fact that I was interviewed by this group.¹

Other than this interview, I at no time prior or subsequent to the said interview have had any association or connection of any kind whatsoever with the Women Strike for Peace. I have absolutely no knowledge or any opinion with regard to this group, either favorable or unfavorable, nor do I know of any of the activities or affiliations of this group or its members.

¹ The committee received and approved a request from Mr. Flink to supplement his testimony with this paragraph and the following one.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Governor, do you have any questions of this witness?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions.

I want to thank you for appearing and helping the committee in this study.

I think, in view of the witness' testimony, it is interesting to the committee that the committee is informed that the third secretary of the Russian Embassy is identified as being present in this hearing at this time.

Call your next witness, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Would Blanche Hofrichter Posner please come forward?

Mr. DOYLE. I will ask the audience to be seated.

I regret to say that if that occurs again I will have to consider it as a demonstration, which is not invited, is not asked for, and is not proper in this hearing.

Govern yourselves accordingly, please, and cooperate.

Will you please stand and be sworn?

Raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. POSNER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF BLANCHE HOFRICHTER POSNER, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, VICTOR RABINOWITZ

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and address for the record?

Mrs. POSNER. Blanche Hofrichter Posner, 67 Sprain Valley Road, Scarsdale, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. POSNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself for the record, stating his name and office address?

Mr. RABINOWITZ. Victor Rabinowitz, 30 East 42d Street, New York.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Posner, would you state the date and place of your birth, please?

Mrs. POSNER. Is the date material? After all, I am a woman, you know. I shall say, though, I am over 21. I was born in Vienna, Austria, quite a number of years ago.

Mr. NITTLE. That will suffice.

Mrs. POSNER. Thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Was your maiden name Hofrichter?

Mrs. POSNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mrs. POSNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. How and when did you become a citizen?

Mrs. POSNER. Through my father, who became a citizen.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Posner, would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. POSNER. Well, I got a B.A. degree from Hunter College. I took postgraduate work at New York University, City College, and Columbia, where I almost got an M.A., but I got bored.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. POSNER. Housewife.

Mr. NITTLE. Prior to that, were you occupied as a teacher?

Mrs. POSNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you hold an official position in an organization known as Women Strike for Peace?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. I must decline to answer that question and I should be very grateful if you would let me say why.

Mr. NITTLE. We are only interested in whether or not you are presenting a legal reason and basis for your refusal to testify. Therefore, I will ask you simply this, and ask you not to make a statement but to respond to the inquiry: Do you assign as your basis for your refusal to testify the constitutional privilege of the fifth amendment?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. I should like to decline to answer the question, but I must please plead with you to let me say why. I have——

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the witness be directed to answer the question addressed to her.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct the witness to answer the question. We believe it is a pertinent question and entirely proper.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. I don't know, sir, why I am here, but I do know why you are here. I think——

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I must ask for regular order.

Mrs. POSNER. —because you don't quite understand the nature of this movement. This movement was inspired and motivated by mothers' love for their children.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman?

Mrs. POSNER. When they were putting their breakfast on the table, they saw not only wheaties and milk, but they also saw strontium 90 and iodine 131.

Mr. DOYLE. Just a moment.

Mrs. POSNER. They feared for the health and life of their children. That is the only motivation.

Mr. DOYLE. Witness! Now, Witness——

Mrs. POSNER. If you gentlemen have children or grandchildren, you should be grateful to the Women Strike for Peace, or whatever peace movement is working to stop nuclear testing. Every nuclear test has resulted in malformations, has resulted in stillbirths, has resulted in leukemia, has resulted in cancer, has resulted in the possibility of a nuclear holocaust.

I have given to you gentlemen this statement which presents some of the reasons why women are concerned.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, Witness, just a minute. I will have to declare you out of order. If you insist on interrupting the hearing, we will have to ask that you be removed from the hearing room. I do not want to do that, and you do not want it. So please cooperate. You have made your little speech. Now proceed and either cooperate with the committee or not, just as you choose.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. I order and direct you to answer that question. We believe it is pertinent, legally. You have made your speech, and we have been glad to give you 2 or 3 minutes to make it. But that is it.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. By virtue of the statement, this will be just the one sentence, Mr. Doyle, by virtue of the statement that you read at this hearing, I must at this point decline to cooperate with the committee and thank God that the framers of our Constitution and the Bill of Rights included the fifth amendment, which I now invoke.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you invoking the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment, Mrs. Posner?

Mrs. POSNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a document marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 1.

This document is entitled "STRUCTURE FOR WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE METROPOLITAN N.Y. NEW JERSEY CONN."

I call your attention to the last item on page 3 of this exhibit, which indicates that you were, and perhaps still are, chairman pro tem of the Office Committee of Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, Connecticut.

Are you the chairman pro tem of the Office Committee of Women Strike for Peace for Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut?

Mrs. POSNER. I must refuse to answer on the same grounds of the fifth amendment.

(Document marked "Posner Exhibit No. 1" follows:)

Posner Exhibit No. 1

STRUCTURE FOR WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE
METROPOLITAN N.Y. NEW JERSEY CONN.

The structure of WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE shall consist of local groups from which chosen representatives then form county groups; from which again chosen representatives form the Central Coordinating Committee.

A local group shall consist of any body of women who have meetings and act in concert for the general purpose of peace. Each such group will be listed in the N.Y. office with the names of two active persons. (This list of names, addresses and telephone numbers will be available only for WSP activities and mailings and are not to be open to any other group). Local groups should hold at least one meeting a month and send a report of that meeting to the Central office. Each group may send 2 delegates to its county meeting.

A county group is composed of delegates representing each local group in the area. This group should report, evaluate and coordinate community activities, implement county actions and appoint representatives to the Central Coordinating Committee. County groups should meet at least once a month, preferably immediately following a C.C.C. meeting. Local groups should then hold their meetings immediately following County meetings.

The Central Coordinating Committee, then, is composed of two representatives from each County or State (Manhattan, Brooklyn, Bronx, Queens, Westchester, Long Island, Connecticut and New Jersey) plus one representative from each Work Committee (see below) plus the N.Y. Office Coordinator. All of these representatives have one vote each. An alternate should be elected by each area and work committee to represent her group in case one of the representatives cannot attend a meeting.

County representatives on the C.C.C. should be delegated for a term of two months and may serve as many terms as their county elects. Representatives from work committees should be delegated by their own committee and shall serve not less than two months nor more than six months.

The C.C.C. will meet regularly twice a month, and may convene themselves for emergency meetings. They will send minutes of each meeting to every local group. A count of 15 women shall be deemed a quorum.

The C.C.C. will base its work on the written reports which have been sent in by the local groups. It shall have the authority to act immediately on emergency policy decisions. Actions shall be determined by a two-thirds vote of the women present at the meeting. It shall approve of all expenditures not exceeding \$1000. For large expenses above \$1000. the C.C.C. must go back to the County groups for permission.

Fosner Exhibit No. 1 (contd.)

It should be emphasized that representatives of local groups to County and C.C.C. meetings must responsibly report back to their originating group.

Local groups are not compelled to work on any action decided upon by the C.C.C., but any action turned down by the C.C.C. may be locally undertaken in the name of the local group of the WSP, provided such action does not conflict with the stated policy of the WSP.

The New York office will be a servicing and coordinating center in charge of lists, mailings, etc. Only central activities should be handled through the office and not those pertaining to only one segment of the movement. It should be staffed by one paid worker to keep the clerical details flowing smoothly and one member of the office committee plus the office coordinator. The local groups must take the responsibility to finance the office.

Work committees shall be open to all who wish to serve on them. Members of these committees shall be restricted to six voting members who shall be committed to serving for 4 months. One new member is to be admitted every two months and one retired. Retirement means only loss of vote in the work committee and ineligibility to serve as a work committee representative on the C.C.C. Continued work participation, however, is welcome. Each committee shall elect its own chairman.

These committees should be consulted in an emergency in the area of their competence. No committee member shall take action or make statements which might be construed as making policy.

Work committees are designated according to their function and new committees may be set up by the C.C.C. when deemed necessary. The following committees have already been established: Action, Press & Public Relations, Literature & Education, Graphic & Visual, National Liaison, Radiation, Finance, International, Legislative, and Office.

The General Assembly of the WSP shall be the highest body of the structure and will make major policy decisions. This group shall consist of one representative from each local group and will meet at least 4 times per year. There, every local may have a place on the agenda to introduce new ideas, present concerns, define future policy, etc. The dates for this group's meetings will be determined by the C.C.C.

Posner Exhibit No. 1 (contd.)

WORK COMMITTEES

| | |
|--|---|
| <u>Action</u> Chairman pro tem. Natalie Leventhal AC 2-5173 | Implements and coordinates particular action for the C.C.C. Available to local groups. |
| <u>Press & Public Relations</u> Chairman pro tem. Lorraine Gordon RE 7-6036 | Press releases, radio, television coverage, contacting editors, etc. |
| <u>Literature & Education</u> Chairman pro tem. Jeannette Vosk WA 4-1478 | Preparation of flyers, mailings, etc. Sifting of peace literature from other sources. Preparation of newsletter. Heading up of discussion groups. |
| <u>Graphic & Visual</u> Chairman pro tem. Lily Landis | Posters, buttons, stickers, letter-heads, etc. |
| <u>National liaison</u> Chairman pro tem. Valerie Delecorte OX 7-0527 | Contact work with other peace groups, women's groups, etc. Speakers' Bureau. |
| <u>Radiation</u> Chairman pro tem. Lynn Gibor GR 3-1242 | Study and counsel on radiation information. Organizing material for mailings, ads, etc. Liaison with scientist's groups. |
| <u>Finance</u> Chairman pro tem. Ruth Chenven GR 7-0368 | Treasurers (3). Accountants. Fund raisers, etc. |
| <u>International</u> Chairman pro tem. Gladys Blum MA 1-1908 | Linguists, translators, contact people, correspondents. Headed by Ruth Gage-Colby, Int. Coordinator |
| <u>Legislative</u> Chairman pro tem. Bella Abzug LO 4-7091 | Political action re disarmament and testing. |
| <u>Office</u> Chairman pro tem. Blanche Posner OX 7-0527 | Typing, mimeographing, filing, taking minutes, etc. Headed by Valerie Dele- * corte, N.Y. Coordinator. |

Mr. RABINOWITZ. Will the committee supply the witness with copies of these exhibits, please? Mr. Chairman, will we get them?

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask that a general order be made for the reception into the record of all exhibits identified in the course of these hearings without a specific request.

Mr. DOYLE. The order is made.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. May the witness be supplied with copies of all of those exhibits so that she may have a copy in accordance with normal legal procedure?

Mr. DOYLE. The witness has refused to identify the document in any way.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. Do I understand you are refusing, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DOYLE. I think you are entitled, Counsel, to a copy of the record.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. The record will include those exhibits?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. Therefore, I will get copies of the exhibits?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. I assume the witness has a copy of that document already.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, Mrs. Posner, isn't a copy of that document in your possession as office chairman of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. POSNER. I must again refuse to answer for the same—on the same grounds, of the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Literature issued bearing the name of this organization indicates that its office is located at 750 Third Avenue, New York City.

How long has your organization occupied offices at this address?

Mrs. POSNER. I must continue to invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you tell the committee how your appointment as chairman of the Office Committee was effected?

Mrs. POSNER. Again, even at the risk of boring you, I must say I refuse to answer the question on the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Posner, Women Strike for Peace, according to numerous press reports, was in its origin a movement of individual American women which sprang up in September 1961 without formal or advanced planning and organization. Allegedly it was sparked by an inspiration that came to Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, of Washington, D.C. It was reported that women throughout the Nation thereafter reacted "spontaneously" to her idea of mobilizing women in action for peace.

Would you tell the committee when the first organizing meeting of Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, was held?

Mrs. POSNER. You seem to be so well informed about this movement, it seems almost supernumerary for me to add to it, so I must again stand on the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. We want to give you an opportunity, Mrs. Posner, to offer any evidence that you desire in confirmation of these matters which are asserted as facts, or to deny or to offer some explanation.

Were you present at that meeting?

Mrs. POSNER. Again I must say the fifth amendment—this is going to get very tiresome. I have been told about certain inquisitorial methods—

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute, Witness. Please stick to the subject matter. You have made your speech.

Mrs. POSNER. Yes, I will. I shall stick to the fifth.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of a document entitled "PROPOSED PLAN OF STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURE FOR WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE NEW YORK NEW JERSEY CONNECTICUT," which is marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 2.

While Exhibit 1, which was shown to you, was the structural plan, Exhibit 2, which I now show you, is apparently a proposed plan which preceded the adoption of Exhibit 1.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the preparation or presentation of Exhibit 2 to your group of Women Strike for Peace at 750 Third Avenue, New York City?

Mr. DOYLE. Let the record show the witness has inspected the document.

Mrs. POSNER. I must decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

(Document marked "Posner Exhibit No. 2" follows:)

Posner Exhibit No. 2

PROPOSED PLAN OF STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURE FOR WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

NEW YORK

NEW JERSEY

CONNECTICUT

It is imperative that a working structure of operation be set up for the entire movement in the given area. We wish to insure the place of each individual to contribute and be heard. It is by ever widening commitment and engagement on the part of each woman that WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE can realize its potential as a national force. To this end, a group of approximately 40 women representing areas in N.Y., Conn., and N.J. met and formulated the following proposal. It is intended that all communities give it their most careful attention bearing in mind that its main purpose is to insure maximum representation of all.

The structure of WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE shall consist of local groups from which chosen representatives then form county or borough groups, from which again chosen representatives form the Central Coordinating Committee. A local group shall consist of any body of women who have meetings and act in concert. Each such group will be listed in the N.Y. office with two key names, addresses, and phone numbers. (This list will be available only for WSP activities and mailings and not to be open to any other group.) Local groups will hold at least one meeting a month and will be obliged to send a detailed report of that meeting to the Central Office. Each group will send delegates to its county or borough meeting.

A county or borough group is composed of delegates representing each local group in the area. This group should report, evaluate, and co-ordinate community activities, implement county or borough actions and appoint representatives to the Central Coordinating Committee. Borough or County meetings to be held immediately following Central Coordinating meetings. (Local group meeting to be held as soon as feasible following county or borough meeting)

The Central Coordinating Committee, then, is composed of two representatives each from each County or Borough; (Manhattan, Brooklyn, Bronx, Westchester, Long Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey) plus one representative from each Work Committee (see below), plus N.Y. Office Coordinator. County or Borough representatives on the Central Coordinating Committee should be delegated for a term of two months and should not be delegated for more than three terms consecutively. Representatives from Work Committees should be delegated to the Central Committee by their own Committees and should be restricted to not more than one two month term at a time.

Work Committees are designated according to their function i.e.,

PRESS and PUBLIC RELATIONS

Press releases, radio, television coverage; public speaking; contacts etc.

LITERATURE and EDUCATION

Preparation of literature, (flyers, agendas, letters, mailings). Sifting of Peace literature from other sources of distribution. Heading up of discussion groups.

GRAPHIC and VISUAL

Posters, Visual ideas such as buttons, stickers, letterheads, etc.

SECRETARIAL COMMITTEE

Typing, Mimeographing, Filing, Recording, Taking Minutes, etc. Headed by Office-Coodinator.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Treasurers (3), Accountants, Fund-Raising idea-people, Bookkeepers.

Posner Exhibit No. 2 (contd.)

COMMUNICATIONS

Distribution, Contacting, Charge of mailing lists, Telephone campaigns, etc.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Communication-network between various State W.S.P. units, Washington, California, Phila., etc. Headed by N.Y. Coordinator

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

Linguists, translators, contact people, Correspondents Headed by International Coordinator.

LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE

Those Qualified to study and advise on law; disarmament progress, the composition of government bodies (disarmament committees) (U.N.) (Congress) for the purpose of informed guidance on political action wherever testing and disarmament are involved.

Work committees should be open to all qualified who wish to serve on them, should be restricted to six standing members who shall be committed to serving for 4 months. One new member is to be admitted every two months and one retired. Retirement means only loss of voice vote in the work committee, and ineligibility to serve as a work-committee representative to the Central Coordinating Committee. Continued workparticipation, however is of course welcome. Women wishing to serve on work committees should apply or be nominated through their own communities via local group reports which will be sent after each monthly meeting to the Central Office, and applications will be filed according to chronological priority till admission. It is important that applications and nominations be accompanied with reasonable qualification references.

The Coordinating Committee made up of area group representatives and work committee representatives will meet regularly once a month and send minutes by mail to each local group. County or Borough groups will meet one week following. Local groups will meet one week following County meetings. Local groups will send meeting reports to C.C.C. for collation and to be used in preparing the agenda for the C.C.C. meeting.

The N.Y. office will be a servicing center, in charge of lists, mailing etc. Only central activities should be handled through the office and not those pertaining to only one segment of the movement. It should be staffed by one paid worker to keep the clerical details flowing smoothly and one member of the secretarial committee plus the office-coordinator. The local groups must take the responsibility to finance the office. Approval of all expenditures except petty cash, shall be made by the C.C.C. plus the treasurers.

The Central Coordinating Committee shall base its work on the written reports which have been sent by local groups. It shall have the authority to act immediately upon policy making decisions. Actions shall be determined by two thirds vote of the representatives on the standing C.C.C.

Local groups are not compelled to work on any action decided upon by the Coordinating Committee, but any action turned down by the Committee shall not be locally undertaken in the name of Women Strike for Peace.

It should be emphasized that representatives of local groups to County and Coordinating Comm. meetings must responsibly report back to their originating group.

Posner Exhibit No. 2 (contd.)

It is hoped that every three months or so we will be able to have a large open meeting in N.Y. where a representative from each local group may have a place on the agenda, to introduce new ideas, present complaints, define future policy etc.

We have come a long way since November 1, 1961. Our desire for a reliable peace remains passionate and unabated. Perhaps we have lost some of our girlish illusions. But we have gained in womanly resolve. We know that we have no role if it is not to work unsparingly for the future of our children and we wish to be as competent, as resourceful and as equipped as possible in the pursuance of this work. The power which is entrusted to rulers by the people must not be turned against the people but must be used to implement their desire and indeed their facility for living at peace with any other people on earth.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, I call your attention to the first paragraph of Exhibit 2, which states that in order for Women Strike for Peace to achieve its end, "a group of approximately 40 women representing areas in N.Y., and Conn., and N.J. met and formulated the following proposal." That is Exhibit 2.

To your knowledge, did 40 women actually meet and formulate the proposal contained in this document?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. I am sorry. I didn't hear the question. I was busy hunting for a match.

Would you please repeat the question, sir?

Mr. NITTLE. I pointed out to you, Mrs. Posner, that Exhibit 2 bears upon it the statement that a group of approximately 40 women representing areas in New York and Connecticut and New Jersey met and formulated the proposal. I asked you whether, to your knowledge, 40 women actually did meet and formulate the proposal contained in that document.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. On constitutional grounds, the fifth amendment, I must decline to answer that question.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know whether or not Exhibit 2, the proposed plan, was drafted prior to the organization meeting referred to in it by any person or persons who were not members of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. POSNER. I must decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that the proposed plan, Exhibit 2, was drafted with the assistance of Leo Huberman; that he did so in consultation with a member, a female member of Women Strike for Peace, Dorothy Monet Rosenwald, at her home, 135 Central Park West, New York City.

Can you confirm or refute this information?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. On the same grounds, sir, I must decline to answer, invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I ought to state for the record that Leo Huberman appeared before the committee last month and in response to questions stated that he was "a Marxist and a socialist."

Do you know of any persons other than Leo Huberman and Dorothy Rosenwald who participated in drawing up this plan?

Mrs. POSNER. Again I must decline, invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that Dorothy Rosenwald presented and read this proposed structural and procedural plan at a meeting of the organization.

Do you have knowledge of this fact?

Mrs. POSNER. The same answer, sir, the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. I also ought to state for the record, Mr. Chairman, that the committee possesses no information that Mrs. Rosenwald is, or has been identified as, a member of the Communist Party.

I want to call your attention also to page 3 of this proposed plan, Posner Exhibit No. 2. The last paragraph opens with these words: "We have come a long way since November 1, 1961."

Does that date refresh your memory as to the time when the organizing meeting of Women Strike for Peace in the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut area took place?

Mrs. POSNER. Again the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you personally acquainted with Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, who has reportedly described herself variously as the starter, coordinator, funnel, and head of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. POSNER. Again I must decline to answer on the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. How long have you known Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, if you have known her?

Mrs. POSNER. Again the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Did Mrs. Wilson play any part at all in the organization of your New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. POSNER. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you obtain Mrs. Wilson's approval for either the proposed structural plan or the plan as finally adopted, evidenced by Posner Exhibits Nos. 2 and 1, respectively, prior to acting on them by your organization?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Posner, it is the committee's information that you were employed as a teacher since 1922 in the New York City public school system, that you resigned as a teacher on September 4, 1952.

The committee's investigation discloses that, in the course of such employment, you were a member of a Communist Party fraction of public school teachers at the DeWitt Clinton High School.

Were you a member of a Communist Party fraction of public school teachers during the course of your employment at the DeWitt Clinton High School in New York City?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. May I ask the pertinency of that piece of information to the Women Strike for Peace movement? Is that permitted, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, indeed. The question must always be pertinent and also the answers should be.

Mrs. POSNER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. But, of course, the statement I read, I think, showed very clearly the pertinency of this question, because we are going into the question in these hearings of the extent, if at all there is any extent, of infiltration of the Women Strike for Peace by Communists.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. But this was 10 years before Women Strike for Peace was organized.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all right, Counsel. We are informed, as our counsel stated, that your client has been identified as a member of a Communist cell while she was a schoolteacher in New York City.

Now, there is no question but that she is a leader of, or actively leading, the Women Strike for Peace in the New York area.

Mr. TUCK. She is now being asked to state whether or not that is true.

Mr. Chairman, I request you to order and direct her to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. So far as we know, she is a Communist now, because there is no evidence that she is not. If she is not, here is an opportunity for her to clear it up.¹

I direct you to answer the question.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. May I ask that the pending question be repeated? It has been quite a while since it was stated.

Mr. NITTLE. Would the reporter read the question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

Mrs. POSNER. The fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, Mrs. Posner?

Mrs. POSNER. The fifth amendment, sir. I am sorry I giggled then. It was just too funny.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of an article marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 3, which appeared on page 26 of the *New York Times* of April 19, 1962, under the byline of Jeanne Molli.

The article is titled "Women's Peace Group Uses Feminine Tactics."

Mrs. POSNER. That leaps to the eye, doesn't it?

Mr. NITTLE. The article states:

In front of St. Patrick's Cathedral in this Sunday's Easter parade, brilliantly colored paper daisies will be spotted throughout the crowd. Attached to hats or the back of barrettes, they will distinguish local adherents of an organization known as Women Strike for Peace.

Did you participate in that parade?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. Apparently the leitmotiv here is fifth amendment.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. That is l-e-i-t.

(Document marked "Posner Exhibit No. 3" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you wear a colored paper daisy to identify yourself as a member of Women Strike for Peace?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. It sounds like such a far cry from communism it is impossible not to be amused.

I still invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Perhaps this is not so amusing.

The article goes on to state with respect to the New York group of Women Strike for Peace:

The office is run by volunteers, including Mrs. Blanche Posner of Scarsdale, a lawyer's wife who serves as office coordinator. She spends as many as ten hours a day working for W.S.P. Her files contain the names of 6,000 local adherents, each of whom, she said, has a list of friends she can call upon.

¹ See clarification of this statement by Mr. Doyle on pp. 2125, 2126.

It would appear from that, Mrs. Posner, that you have volunteered many hours and many days of work in the New York office of Women Strike for Peace.

Have you done this upon the request or on orders of any person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. POSNER. Fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. The article states that your files in the Women Strike for Peace contain the names of 6,000 local adherents.

From whom did you obtain this list of persons?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on my constitutional rights and invoke still again the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you receive any listings from any person or persons known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. POSNER. The fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you receive listings from any organization known to you to be Communist-controlled, or designated as subversive or Communist by the Attorney General or by any other official agency of Government?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you obtain any of the 6,000 names which are reported to be in your files from Mrs. Dagmar Wilson or her Washington office?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. As office chairman, Exhibit 1 states your duties to be that of typing, mimeographing, filing, taking minutes of meetings, and so forth.

I assume that you have had access to all of the records in the headquarters of Women Strike for Peace. Is that not correct?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you transmitted any information which is contained in your files to any person or persons known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a photograph which is marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 4.

This is a photograph of the picket line established at the White House in Washington on April 28, 1962, by Women Strike for Peace.

Do you not appear in that photograph as the second person in the line from the right carrying a sign, "WE HAVE NO RIGHT TO TEST"?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. The fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your response to the inquiry as to whether you appear on that picket line at the White House?

Mrs. POSNER. The same response as before, I stand on the fifth.

(Document marked "Posner Exhibit No. 4" follows:)



Picket-line demonstration before the White House, Washington, D.C., April 28, 1962.

Mr. NITTLE. I now hand you a copy of a document titled "BIBLIOGRAPHY," which is marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 5.

It is a list of literature and sources for literature on the subject of war, peace, disarmament, nuclear testing, and related subjects.

Is it not a fact, Mrs. Posner, that you distributed this bibliography as "recommended reading" at a meeting of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. POSNER. The same answer, sir, the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you prepare that list?

Mrs. POSNER. The fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. I call you attention to page 2 of the bibliography, and specifically to item 14 thereof, which is entitled, "Many Valuable & Informative Publications Are Available."

The first organization named in this item is the "Greenwich Village Peace Centre," of 133 West 3d Street, New York City.

When you distributed that bibliography, did you know that the Greenwich Village Peace Center was headed by John W. Darr?

Mrs. POSNER. Again the fifth, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you know that John W. Darr has been identified as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. POSNER. I plead the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you inform the members of Women Strike for Peace of this fact?

Mrs. POSNER. I plead the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. I call your attention to item 11 of that bibliography, a publication entitled *Peace Monthly*. The exhibit describes that publication as a "Broad discussion of issues relating to peace," and notes that it is published by the "Conference of Greater New York [Peace] Groups" of 550 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. Conference of Greater New York Groups?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mrs. POSNER. Is that a question?

Mr. NITTLE. No.

When you distributed this bibliography, did you know that the leader of that organization, Henry Abrams, had been publicly denounced as a veteran member of the Communist Party and, in January 1961, was ousted from the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy at a time when it was attempting to eliminate Communists who had infiltrated that organization?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on the fifth.

(Document marked "Posner Exhibit No. 5" follows:)

Posner Exhibit No. 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Press reports and editorials have been replete with dire forebodings as to the outcome at the Geneva Conference. It is disastrous, both psychologically and politically, to approach negotiations in a defeatist mood and an attitude of distrust. Our President in his UN address has promised us that "To halt the spiraling arms race, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement." "New avenues" must be based on a new approach--one which is based on belief that in an atomic age, war is no longer a rational solution to international differences. Patient negotiation has become imperative as never before.

Some of us are frustrated in our approach to others on the question of achieving peace. The following are valuable sources to which we can turn for answers based on reason and facts:

- 1.) WOMEN'S PEACE MOVEMENT BULLETIN...Editor Elsie Boulding
2670 Bedford Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan
(A monthly information exchange for all women's groups in communication with Women Strike for Peace. Inspiring coast-to-coast news. Sub. \$2.00)
- 2.) WINDOW ON THE WORLD...Editor Mary H. Weik
150 Christopher St., New York 14, Box 148
- 3.) I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY
5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington 50, D. C.
(Carefully documented facts not usually found in mass media publications) Sub. \$5.00
- 4.) FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
Box 271, Nyack, New York
(Strong support for social justice and peace, e.g., a perceptive article by Thomas Merton, a Trappist monk, author of "The Seven Storey Mountain").
- 5.) ARE WE ON THE ROAD TO WAR?...Dr. Leo Szilard
Obtainable at Michael Brower, 3 Dana Street, Cambridge 38, Mass. 25¢
- 6.) PROBLEMS OF DISARMAMENT
Monthly Review Press, 333 Sixth Ave., New York 14
(Articles by Hans A. Bethe and five Cornell professors)
- 7.) TEN MINUTES FOR PEACE
Institute for International Order, 11 West 42nd St., New York 17
(This is an experiment in thinking, both provocative and stimulating.)
- 8.) EVALUATION OF JANUARY 15TH DEMONSTRATION
750 Third Ave., N.Y.C. - Seventh Floor - Room 15
(Contains interviews with Congressmen and visits to Embassies. Contains excerpts of messages received from women in foreign countries who responded to our January 15th demonstration in Washington.)
- 9.) SAME WORLD (leaflet)
17 East 45th Street, N.Y.C.
(Monthly report on disarmament, etc. \$3.00 per year)

Posner Exhibit No. 5 (contd.)

- 10.) **MILK FACT SHEET PLUS QUESTION & ANSWER PAMPHLET**
(By Committee on Radiation in Food)
Box 421, Bedford Hills, New York - \$5.00 per 1000
- 11.) **PEACE MONTHLY**
Conference of Greater New York Groups, 550 5th Ave., N.Y.C.
(Broad discussion of issues relating to peace.)
- 12.) **BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS**
(Magazine of Science & Public Affairs)
5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois - \$6.00 annually
- 13.) **WAR/PEACE REPORT**
(Current Fact & Opinion on Progress toward World Law & Order)
305 West 18th St., N.Y.C. - \$5.00 annually
- 14.) **MANY VALUABLE & INFORMATIVE PUBLICATIONS ARE AVAILABLE**
Greenwich Village Peace Centre, 133 West 3rd St., N.Y.C.
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, 160 W. 73rd St., N.Y.C.
Carnegie International Centre, 345 E. 46th St., N.Y.C.
The Friends' Service Committee, 218 E. 18th St., N.Y.C.

* * * * *

BE ON THE LOOK-OUT FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS FROM....

- WASHINGTON....."Cherry Blossom Cavalcade" for WSFP in early April.
(Date to be announced)
- CHICAGO....."Pennies for Peace, Inc." The pennies saved will be officially presented, in the form of a check, made out to U Thant, toward the support of the United Nations. Presentation will take place at 10 a.m. on March 21. Checks should be made out to "Pennies for Peace, Inc." and mailed to: Mrs. Ralph Dolkart
Box 1309, Evanston, Illinois
- SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA....."Women's Peace Plane to Moscow" with stops in Washington, D.C., Montreal, London, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Helsinki, Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev, Vienna. (Planned for late in September.) For information write or call:
Mrs. Gladys Farber, WISP, Box 69611, Los Angeles 69, Calif.
- NEW YORK.....Committee is being organized by the Women's Direct Action Committee, for those who wish to run for office on a Peace platform. For information call: Mrs. Clarice Melman, UN 4-0056
- WASHINGTON.....Lobby by proxy offered to women around the country! Women in Washington are preparing to call on Congressmen on behalf of constituents in other states. All States are requested to keep them informed on recent contacts with their representatives. For further information write or call: Folly Fodor, Women Strike for Peace, 1822 Mass. Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

SPECIAL NOTE:

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions
133 East 54th Street
Profoundly thoughtful analyses of international controversies.

Mr. NITTLE. One final question: Do you have knowledge of the existence of a Communist Party caucus within the New York area organization of Women Strike for Peace which meets separately to coordinate policy and the selection of candidates for office within your organization?

Mrs. POSNER. The same answer, sir, the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a member of that caucus?

Mrs. POSNER. I stand on the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any questions, Governor Tuck?

Mr. TUCK. Mrs. Posner, the committee has information that you are chairman pro tem of the Office/Committee of Women Strike for Peace. I would ask you to state whether or not that is true.

Mrs. POSNER. I must continue to stand on the fifth, sir.

Mr. TUCK. Are you telling the committee that you honestly apprehend that if you stated whether or not—

Mrs. POSNER. I am sorry, I can't hear you, sir.

Mr. TUCK. I said, do you honestly apprehend that if you stated to this committee whether or not you are an officer, an important officer, of Women Strike for Peace that you would subject yourself, or possibly subject yourself, to criminal prosecution?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. In view of the chairman's statement at the opening of this hearing, in his alleging that the Women Strike for Peace is an infiltrated group, infiltrated by Communists, I have no choice but to plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. TUCK. You still have not answered my question. You cannot rely on the fifth amendment unless you apprehend that you may probably be subjecting yourself to criminal prosecution.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POSNER. That is the only answer I can give.

As I said earlier in my speech, I thank God for the wise men—

Mr. TUCK. We are not here to listen—

Mrs. POSNER. —who gave us a Constitution and a Bill of Rights that includes the fifth amendment.

Mr. TUCK. We are not here to listen to your discussion. I asked you a simple question which any patriotic citizen ought to be able to answer.

I request you, Mr. Chairman, to— (disturbance)

Mr. JACK LEVINE (a spectator at the hearing). I am a patriotic American citizen and a former FBI agent. I petition you to discontinue these proceedings before you heap further disgrace on the Congress of the United States.

[Capitol Police escort Mr. Levine from the hearing room.]

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, I request that you order and direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. Witness, I direct you to answer that question. It manifestly is pertinent. You have heard Governor Tuck ask it twice, the same question.

What is your answer? This does not call for a speech by you.

Mrs. POSNER. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. TUCK. Then you decline to answer the question?

Mrs. POSNER. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you once again to answer that question.

Mrs. POSNER. I continue to rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Are there any other questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I just wish to make this observation, Witness. I was in hopes, with your reputed connection with Women Strike for Peace, that you might be able to give us some really bona fide history of the organization.

Mrs. POSNER. Mr. Doyle, I shall be delighted to do it outside of these chambers, which have a special character.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not relating it to who is Communist in it or anything of the sort, if there are any. I am relating to the history of the organization. Certainly, I think I know enough of the organization to know that no one needs to plead the fifth amendment when they are asked about who are the officers of the group and whether or not they have held meetings and who helped organize it. That is the way I look at it. I was in hopes that you could frankly help us in that element of our hearings.

Mrs. POSNER. I shall be delighted to, Mr. Doyle. I understand that hundreds of women have sent in letters, asking that they be called as witnesses, in which event you would get a complete, nationwide history of the movement.

Mr. DOYLE. You do not answer the pertinent questions. You are in a position, we happen to believe, as one of the outstanding leaders in this organization, to give us the history. That is one reason we are asking this question, to help us in our study. But you have refused to do it by claiming the fifth amendment, even on questions involving the history of the organization.

You see, this committee takes the position that you leaders, knowing that all members in the group are not Communists by a long shot—I want to make it clear that this committee does not believe that, that we know it is not true, but we do know that some are.

Mrs. POSNER. You see, we do not ask our members whether they are or are not this, that, or the other thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course not.

Mrs. POSNER. If they want to work for peace, we love them.

Mr. DOYLE. I raised that thought with you because I think that the women who are not Communists, who are opposed to communism, are entitled to know who in the organization is a Communist and whether or not it has been infiltrated by Communists and, if so, where they are lodged. That is the purpose of some of these questions.

There are women in this room who are not Communists and never would be.

Here was your chance to clear it up for their records, how this organization was started, as far as you are concerned, and who is in it. But you have refused to do it.

I direct you once again to answer that question asked by Governor Tuck.

Mrs. POSNER. May I say one sentence before I answer?

Mr. DOYLE. Make it short.

Mrs. POSNER. I will.

The women in this movement are bright; they are educated; they have love for children, which has motivated us.

Please let me answer.

No group of Communists could have duped these women into being led away from an American democratic position.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, your time is up.

We happen to know from experience that the Communists can dupe most anyone they set about duping.

Mrs. POSNER. We are too bright for that.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mrs. POSNER. You are very welcome, Mr. Doyle. And thank you. You have been very, very cooperative.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. Will you please direct the reporter, Mr. Chairman, to send us a copy of the hearing and the exhibits? That will be in accord with your earlier statement in the hearing.

Mr. DOYLE. I will take it under consideration with the counsel.

Mr. RABINOWITZ. You said you would do it. I know you usually keep your word and I assume you will this time.

Mr. DOYLE. You understand, Counsel, that there is a fee for doing it, the usual charge for it. You know that rule yourself, I happen to know.

Call your next witness, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Ruth Meyers, please.

Mr. Chairman, we have called Ruth Meyers as the next witness in view of the fact that Mrs. Norma Spector, who was intended to be called prior to Mrs. Meyers, is unable to be present. Mildred Roth, an attorney in New York, forwarded a doctor's certificate explaining that Mrs. Spector was discharged from the hospital on November 15, after an operation, and requesting postponement of her appearance.

The staff has conducted some additional investigation, as a result of which, it is recommended, Mr. Chairman, that the appearance of Mrs. Spector as a witness be postponed indefinitely. I submit the certificate of the doctor.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move that her appearance be postponed indefinitely, until such time as she is able to appear.

Mr. DOYLE. Let the record show that Governor Tuck has moved the postponement at this hearing, so far as Mrs. Spector is concerned, based upon her counsel's communication. Therefore, the order will be that it will be postponed to an indefinite date.

Would you please rise and be sworn, Mrs. Meyers?

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. MEYERS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF RUTH MEYERS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, LEONARD BOUDIN

Mrs. MEYERS. Mr. Doyle, I wonder if I could very respectfully talk to you just for 90 seconds. I know it is very hard to believe that there are women of few words, but I did listen to a rather long statement that you made before this hearing and I wonder if I could be afforded the same courtesy. I will limit my time, as I said, to 90 seconds.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the committee, any statement that she has to make must be filed 48 hours before with the committee.

Mrs. MEYERS. I understand that, sir. I didn't plan on a statement, but I have some comments as a result of what you said, Mr. Chairman, before, and meaning it all to be very respectful in saying it.

Mr. DOYLE. I think we better proceed, with all due respect to you and to the statement I made.

Mrs. MEYERS. I think, Mr. Doyle, you are very interested in knowing the kind of women who are involved in Women Strike for Peace, and I think perhaps my telling this will elucidate——

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, we are interested in obtaining information in response to inquiries, to questions, enunciated by counsel.

Mr. DOYLE. We are sorry, but we just can't digress from our program. We have certain witnesses and a limited time. I know you will cooperate.

Mrs. MEYERS. I certainly will, Mr. Doyle, but knowing you and your reputation and your agreement with many points of our program, I thought you would like to know me as I was 12 days ago before I was subpoenaed by this committee, because I am a different me.

Mr. DOYLE. I will be glad to have you tell me outside of the committee, then.

Mrs. MEYERS. That is just the point I would like to make, sir, that me answering your questions inside this committee cannot be the same me that is answering questions of you; and what I do outside this committee room, I think you and I would find mutually very helpful to us.

Mr. DOYLE. I know there are problems for all of us. I will have to ask counsel to just proceed and for you to cooperate as far as you feel it is right in answering.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mrs. MEYERS. Ruth Meyers, 3 The Tulips, Roslyn, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Mrs. MEYERS. July 7, 1923, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. You are Mrs. William Meyers, are you not?

Mrs. MEYERS. Yes, I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. MEYERS. I was graduated in 1940 from Walton High School. I received a bachelor of arts degree in 1944 from Hunter College and a master of science in education in 1958 from Hofstra College.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am a housewife, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I neglected to ask whether you are represented by counsel.

Mrs. MEYERS. Aply.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself for the record, stating his name and office address?

Mr. BOUDIN. Leonard B. Boudin, 30 East 42d Street, New York.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you in the past been a teacher?

Mrs. MEYERS. No, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Did I understand you to state that you had a master of science in education?

Mrs. MEYERS. Right.

Mr. NITTLE. May I ask what is the present occupation of your husband?

Mrs. MEYERS. He is an attorney.

Mr. NITTLE. The last witness' husband is also an attorney, is that not correct?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am here, sir, to testify on me and my activities, sir. I learned as much as you did.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you know the prior witness, Mrs. Blanche Posner?

Mrs. MEYERS. I will have to insist, sir, that I am here to testify on myself and my relationship to Women Strike for Peace and not as it affects any other individual, because I am involved in Women Strike for Peace, not because of the individuals involved, but because the manner of the program which it does promote.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Blanche Posner, according to the public records and also the committee's information, is the Office Committee chairman of Women Strike for Peace. It is important to know, in our investigation of this subject today, whether you, as a member of Women Strike for Peace, know Mrs. Posner.

Mrs. MEYERS. If I can be helpful in telling you, sir, my role in Women Strike for Peace, I will. But other people's roles, I could not evaluate or tell you at this time.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you presently a member of a group known as Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. No, sir. Women Strike for Peace has no membership. I am associated with a group of women in my own community that are called Women for Peace, and we have acted in situations and activities under the banner of Women Strike for Peace when we agreed to the necessity and importance of when we were going to learn something from this activity.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you be described as an "adherent" of Women Strike for Peace? That was the expression used by the *New York Times* in describing the type of membership which Women Strike for Peace enjoys.

Mrs. MEYERS. Well, could you explain to me what you mean by that question?

Mr. NITTLE. Perhaps this will help elucidate the inquiry. I show you Posner Exhibit No. 1, which is the structural plan of Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Have you seen that plan before?

(Document handed to witness.)

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MEYERS. I did not actually see this plan. It was reported by a woman who had seen it and talked about it and discussed it.

Mr. BOUDIN. Shall I return it to you, Mr. Nittle?

Mr. NITTLE. All right. Thank you.

You are familiar, I understand, with the structural organization of Women Strike for Peace as evidenced by this plan?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am familiar to the extent of the role that I play in it. I must say that I was not particularly interested in the structure of Women Strike for Peace. I was more involved in my own community activities and what role I can do as positive. I felt that structure, other than the old telephone, was not much of what I was interested in.

Mr. NITTLE. When did you organize a group known as Women for Peace in your community?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am trying to think of when we started using the term, because it was just a term that was convenient to use when we were studying and working together. I can tell you when I became involved and interested in involving myself in studying a more active role in peace, if this would be a help.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you tell us the approximate date when you organized a group of Women for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. I don't think you understand what I said previously when you asked me that question. I did not organize the Women for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in its organization?

Mrs. MEYERS. I participated in activities and study with a group of women. At that time, when we were studying and when we were talking and when we were coming to a conclusion to participate further, and in further communities, we did say that, as women who were interested in peace and called Women for Peace, we were going to do such and such.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the creation of this local organization, Women for Peace, in Long Island, for the purpose of sending representatives to county groups who were acting on behalf of Women Strike for Peace of New York?

Mrs. MEYERS. If I have gone to other communities, it has never been as a representative for anything except a point of view, and my own point of view. Usually, people went because they were free for time or in the evening or they felt particularly motivated on a particular program on which they were talking or groups of people were talking.

Mr. NITTLE. Posner Exhibit No. 1, Structure for Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, sets up a Central Coordinating Committee, which appears to be the executive and policymaking body of the group.

Appointments to the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace are accomplished in this way. Local groups of Women for Peace or Women Strike for Peace are set up in various communities, who are then entitled to choose representatives to send to a county meeting of Women Strike for Peace, and the county meeting selects representatives who represent the county group on the Central Coordinating Committee.

This group of Women for Peace, of which I think you state you are a participating member—

Mrs. MEYERS. I participate when the action—when I am particularly motivated in the action and study—

Mr. NITTLE. I did not ask what motivated you. I asked if you were a participating member. Would you please answer the question?

Mrs. MEYERS. If an organization doesn't agree, in which you join and unjoin, I don't see how I can answer the question of whether or not I am a member. When I am there, I am very anxious and excited about a particular program and a particular interest that I have.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you please tell us approximately when your group was first organized?

Mrs. MEYERS. Can I tell you when I first became interested?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, would you tell us that?

Mrs. MEYERS. Yes, I certainly will. I think it was October 31 that we heard of the first Russian explosion in the new nuclear tests that the Russians were starting. At the time I was terribly disturbed because I had heard so much—I heard and read—

Mr. NITTLE. I am not interested in the details of that. I simply asked you the date when you first met with Women for Peace, and you stated October 31; did you not?

Mrs. MEYERS. No. I said October 31 was when I became disturbed and realized I wanted to do something immediately. The next day—

Mr. NITTLE. You became disturbed following the breaking of the moratorium by Soviet Russia in August 1961, at which time they resumed nuclear testing. Between the time that the Russians tested and before the United States resumed nuclear testing, you found you were disturbed and you met with a group of Women for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am sorry, sir. You will have to repeat that. I don't understand you.

Mr. NITTLE. Well, I am trying to understand what you are saying. I think if you will simply answer the questions as directly as you can, we may both avoid confusion.

Mrs. MEYERS. Would you reword the question, please, or repeat the question?

Mr. NITTLE. Would you plainly state the time when you first met with Women for Peace in your community?

Mrs. MEYERS. The first time I met with Women for Peace was not in my community.

Mr. NITTLE. Was it after the announcement by Mrs. Dagmar Wilson in September of the formation of her group known as Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. No, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Was it before that occasion?

Mrs. MEYERS. In September? I am sorry. I thought you meant in response—was it after—would you repeat the date? I am sorry.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Meyers, with a master's degree from—well, I will withdraw that statement.

Mr. BOUDIN. I think it well that counsel withdrew his statement.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me repeat the question.

Did you meet with Women for Peace prior or subsequent to the announcement by Mrs. Dagmar Wilson of the formation of her organization, Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. The first time I met—I met with any women who I know were working for peace—was on November 1 of the year. Whether it was prior or subsequent to—you said her call was September, so, therefore, it was subsequent to that.

Mr. NITTLE. Does your group send a representative to any county group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. Our group tries to get one of us to attend any county meeting or any New York meeting that is held. Sometimes it is pretty much left at the last minute, that a child is sick or a husband doesn't come home.

Mr. NITTLE. The answer is, your group does send a representative to the county groups?

Mrs. MEYERS. When there is one available, we certainly do.

Mr. BOUDIN. I think it would be helpful when the witness is in the middle of an answer that she not be interrupted, even by counsel trying to be helpful. I will make no further comments on that at this point. I hope I won't have to in the future.

Mr. NITTLE. The committee's investigation indicates that you are one of the leaders responsible for making arrangements for the New York group of Women Strike for Peace to take part in the White House picket line on January 15, 1962. Is this correct?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am very proud of the role that I did have in trying to assemble and work and walking around the White House and just looking at it and understanding what we women could do to register our disturbance at the time of the tests.

Mr. NITTLE. Is it not also correct that you were the chairman of a committee selected to make appointments with Congressmen in Washington on that occasion?

Mrs. MEYERS. I was the telephone contact.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Meyers, it is also the committee's information that you played a leading role in arranging the sendoff demonstration at Idlewild Airport on April 1, 1962, by Women Strike for Peace for the delegates of that organization who were leaving to attend the 17-nation Geneva disarmament conference in Switzerland. Is this correct?

Mrs. MEYERS. It was one of the most pleasant things I ever did. It was really inspiring to see women leave a house and their homes, being sponsored by their friends and people interested in peace, to see what they could do in any way to say to the men who were working, "Look at us. Worry about us. Worry about our children. Please, please, negotiate a firmer peace."

Mr. NITTLE. The question simply is this, Mrs. Meyers, and we are not inquiring into your motives at this point, but inquiring whether you did play a leading role in arranging the sendoff demonstration. Did you or did you not?

Mrs. MEYERS. I did and, Mr. Nittle, I thought you were most interested in my motives.

Mr. NITTLE. Let us proceed to the next question.

Mrs. MEYERS. I really thought that was the subject of this investigation, what motivated me to be a member of Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. The attendance of Women Strike for Peace observers at the Geneva conference was clearly the most spectacular accomplishment of Women Strike for Peace. Reportedly, a total of 51 delegates, led by Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, went to Switzerland by air to express the views of Women Strike for Peace to the delegates at the 17-nation disarmament conference.

It is the information of the committee that your New York group of Women Strike for Peace made the arrangements with Swissair lines for this trip and that the names of the persons who were to attend the Geneva conference were announced at a special meeting of Women Strike for Peace in New York City on March 22, 1962. Is it a fact that this expedition to Geneva was conceived, planned, and arranged by the New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. Sir, I was involved, as you said, in the sendoff demonstration. I felt that I was totally involved in wanting to see women go. The conception of the program gets so lost when hundreds of women are thinking about it. Sometimes we find that we are coming to the same idea at the same time, and no one looks for credit. We just look for activity. Whether it was the conception of the New York committee or not, I think, as you say, it is spectacular that it was done. That is the most important thing.

Mr. NITTLE. I do not like to interrupt you at all times, but perhaps if you stick to the point, it won't be necessary. The question simply was whether it is a fact that the expedition to Geneva was conceived, planned, and arranged by the New York group of Women Strike for Peace.

What is your answer to that question?

Mrs. MEYERS. I don't know.

Mr. NITTLE. Who made your appointment to serve as the leader for the sendoff demonstration?

Mrs. MEYERS. Sometimes I wish I would have to have everything—

Mr. NITTLE. Would you simply answer that question?

Mrs. MEYERS. I remember getting a phone call from a friend of mine who said, "So many people are involved with one aspect or another. You are not very busy right now. Please see what you can do and arrange. Would you take over the physical responsibilities of the sendoff thing?"

I was very excited about this. I think I would have liked to have gone, but nobody asked me. So I was very happy to help arrange the sendoff—

Mr. NITTLE. Was this telephone call received from a member of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am afraid, sir, I don't even remember who originally asked me to do it. I remember—

Mr. NITTLE. Was it a female voice or a male voice that made this request?

Mrs. MEYERS. It was certainly not a friend; otherwise, I would remember.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know Mrs. Dagmar Wilson?

Mrs. MEYERS. Sir, as I said before, I am very much interested in doing whatever I can to tell the role that I played in Women Strike for Peace. Beyond this, I do not think it would be fitting for me to answer in terms of my relationships with other people, because I am not interested in the people. I am interested in the particular issues for which I stand when I stand with Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. We are interested in certain activities within Women Strike for Peace. In order to determine what these activities are, which are conducted by people, we must know what people do. I am not asking you about someone who is not connected with Women Strike for Peace. We are inquiring into the activities particularly of this New York group of Women Strike for Peace. Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, of Washington, D.C., is the ostensible leader of the nationwide movement. Therefore, I want to ask you whether there was any contact between your group and Mrs. Dagmar Wilson. You can answer that very simply.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MEYERS. Could you please clarify? I am confused. On what meetings do you refer to, and the contact with whom?

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know Mrs. Dagmar Wilson? That is a very simple question.

Mrs. MEYERS. Again I would say, this is unrelated to my activity in Women Strike for Peace, because I am not in Women Strike for Peace because of any individual except my own deep motivations, in which I am very interested in finding a way to have it heard. I believe that as an American citizen I have a right to have my will expressed and that my Government must function to the will of the people.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you understand the question, Mrs. Meyers? Help us by answering that question.

Mr. BOUDIN. I wonder whether counsel wouldn't indicate the pertinency of the question, to help the witness.

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel; would you do that?

Mr. NITTLE. I think the pertinency of that question is indisputably clear, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think we need subject ourselves to a delaying tactic on that point.

Mr. BOUDIN. It was a very small delay.

Mr. NITTLE. I think an explanation has been made, both in the chairman's opening statement and by myself, as we proceeded. I, therefore, again respectfully request that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mrs. MEYERS. Mr. Doyle, if it was said to me that Mrs. So-and-so or Mrs. So-and-so stands for such a program, do you stand for the program, I would be able to tell you how I feel about the program. But when it is a case of just personal associations, I think my rights under the first amendment—

Mr. DOYLE. I understand that, and we are not questioning motives in these hearings at all. We are not going into that. The question only bears on whether or not there is any connection between the women that you are associated with and the leadership of Mrs. Wilson in Washington. That is the question.

Mrs. MEYERS. I think I have answered, Mr. Doyle, that we have tried to keep contact in every way with anyone who is interested in promoting a basic program for working towards peaceful alternatives in this world. So that would include everyone and anyone who I felt were working for peace.

When I have to answer about a particular person, I don't think that is related to my activities in Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. DOYLE. It is related to whether or not your group is affiliated, or in any way connected, with the Washington group.

Mrs. MEYERS. I have reached personally with anyone I knew, to hold hands with anyone at all in this country or in Europe or any place who is interested in seeking out peaceful alternatives to solving the world's problems on which a bomb seems to be the biggest solution. I think that is inclusive enough, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I understand that, but, really, the question is whether or not there is any connection—that is what it goes to—between your group and the Washington group led by Mrs. Wilson.

Mrs. MEYERS. I think when I am asked about particular people, there is a value then, in terms of personal association, and I will answer in terms of how my activities in peace were being promoted within this group.

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead, Counsel.

First, Mrs. Meyers, I will direct you to answer that question.

Mrs. MEYERS. I decline to answer that question on my rights under the first amendment, to associate freely, and, also, because I feel that this is not pertinent to the inquiry, to the role that I have in this inquiry, and because of my constitutional privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Very well. Proceed, Counsel.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Meyers, when you invoke the fifth amendment, do you invoke the self-incrimination clause?

Mrs. MEYERS. I am relying on that part of the fifth amendment which provides that no person shall be required to be a witness against himself.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Meyers, it appears from the public records that a Ruth Meyers, then residing at 1751 East 10th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., on July 27, 1948, signed a Communist Party nominating petition for Simon W. Gerson, an identified Communist, who was then publicly seeking the office of councilman for the Borough of Brooklyn in New York City.

Are you the Ruth Meyers who executed that petition?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MEYERS. No, sir.

Mr. BOUDIN. Could I see the petition?

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a photostatic copy of that petition, marked for identification as Meyers Exhibit No. 1.

Mrs. MEYERS. I never resided at that address, and it is not my signature.

(Document marked "Meyers Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. BOUDIN. It is rather interesting to speculate, Mr. Doyle, as to whether the witness was called because a similar name appears on a petition.

Mr. TUCK. I object to the counsel interrupting.

Mr. BOUDIN. I was addressing myself to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. The witness answered positively.

Mrs. MEYERS. Except, Mr. Doyle, when that question is put, it shows the intent of this committee. Anyone who talks for peace must be——

Mr. DOYLE. No, you misjudged the intent, Mrs. Meyers.

Mrs. MEYERS. I don't think I misjudged, Mr. Chairman. It is like the taxi driver that I got caught in traffic with. I must say that he objected to a parade and said, "You must be a Communist if you objected to a parade."

Mr. DOYLE. You answered frankly and immediately that you were not the same person, but we certainly want to know with whom we are dealing.

Mrs. MEYERS. Why? Because I stand for peace? Do you have to find out——

Mr. DOYLE. No, because someone with your name signed that Communist petition.

Mrs. MEYERS. Perhaps, sir, I shouldn't have accepted that subpoena, if there are so many people by the name of Ruth Meyers.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Meyers, have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. MEYERS. And this is a continuation of the intent of that first question. If I stand for peace, I have to stand up here and say or answer this question. I think, sir, Mr. Doyle, that this is a disgrace, and any American who takes a dissenting role——

Mr. NITTLE. Will you please answer the question?

Mr. BOUDIN. You are interrupting the witness.

Mr. NITTLE. The question is a simple one. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. MEYERS. I don't think, sir, you ask any simple questions at any time. I think there is a real intent in this question.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer. It is always a pertinent question in this hearing.

Mrs. MEYERS. I don't believe it is a pertinent question, sir, and I don't believe it is within the jurisdiction.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer the question.

Mr. BOUDIN. Could we have the question repeated so we are perfectly clear?

Mr. DOYLE. I think it is perfectly clear.

Mr. BOUDIN. Once a direction is given, it is better to have the question repeated, I think you will agree.

Mr. NITTLE. The question addressed to the witness, Mr. Doyle, and I now address it to the witness, is: Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. MEYERS. I decline to answer that question. I decline to answer because it is not pertinent. I am here to answer questions on Women Strike for Peace, and this question is thrown over as a smoke screen for this kind of investigation. I stand on my constitutional privileges of the fifth amendment not to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

I want to instruct the witness to answer the question. I call your attention to the pertinency. I read in my preliminary statement, and you heard it, the subject of this inquiry—to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, particularly in the Metropolitan New York area, with special reference to the Women Strike for Peace, and, also, to determine the degree to which Communists have responded to the previously quoted directives that they engage in.

Manifestly, the question of whether or not you have ever been a Communist is pertinent.

Mrs. MEYERS. I decline to answer that question under my rights under the first amendment, under my constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment, because I feel the committee does not have jurisdiction, Mr. Doyle, and it is not pertinent, even though you state; this is my feeling.

Mr. DOYLE. Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. MEYERS. My answer is as previously stated.

Mr. BOUDIN. I assume, Mr. Doyle, you don't need the witness to spell out the reasons again.

Mr. DOYLE. No. I instruct you to answer that question, Mrs. Meyers.

Mrs. MEYERS. Shall I spell out all four reasons again, sir?

Mr. DOYLE. No, it will be enough if you say, "The same answer," but I want to instruct you to answer.

Mrs. MEYERS. It is the same answer.

Mr. NITTLE. One final question, Mrs. Meyers. Have you engaged in activities of Women Strike for Peace, and a local group you have described and identified as Women for Peace, to carry out Communist directives enjoining peace agitation upon its members?

Mrs. MEYERS. Mr. Doyle, I think that question is an insult to an American citizen who has tried in the best way to fulfill her duty as a citizen, to have to use her to inquire further into why situations exist,

to go out of her way in every single way to present the program publicly. Anything I have done for Women Strike for Peace is public record, and that question can only be done to intimidate my neighbor or my friend who has come along with me.

Mr. DOYLE. Let's have your answer.

Mrs. MEYERS. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. And I have no questions.

Call the next witness, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Would Lyla Hoffman please come forward?

Mr. DOYLE. Will the witness please rise and be sworn?

Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LYLA HOFFMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Lyla Hoffman, 6 Shore Drive, Great Neck, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you formerly a resident of 68B 8th Lane, Brooklyn, N.Y.?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Counsel, should I not identify myself for the record?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir. I am sorry I did not note that.

Now that the name and the residence of the witness is identified, Mrs. Hoffman, I would like to ask whether you are represented by counsel.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I am represented by Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. My name is Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your marital status, Mrs. Hoffman?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I am married.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your occupation?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Housewife.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. And I am a peace worker, I might add.

Mr. NITTLE. Housewife and peace worker?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. High school, at Richmond, Manhattan.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you spell your first name, please?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. L-y-l-a.

Mr. NITTLE. I have asked for the correct spelling of your name because of an item that appeared in the official Communist paper *The Worker* on April 22, 1962, at page 4. This is marked for identification as Hoffman Exhibit No. 1.

(Document handed to witness.)

Mr. NITTLE. An article appears thereon written under the byline of Mike Davidow titled, "Women Call 24-Hour White House Vigil to Mark the Shame of T-Day."

The article states, among other things, that:

WOMEN from all over the nation are being called to participate in a 24-hour vigil in front of the White House on [sic] 1 p.m. on the day following the announcement of testing.

The action was made known last week by the Women Strike for Peace at their first N.Y. report meeting on their recent delegation to the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

The meeting, attended by more than 1,000, was held at the Community Church, 35 St. and Park Ave.

The vigil will be a somber protest against President Kennedy's decision to test, the sponsors of the action said.

The article describes the meeting held at the Community Church and summarizes the substance of statements made at the meeting. Among others who are reported to have spoken was a Lila Hoffman. Lila is spelled L-i-l-a.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I am the same Lyla Hoffman.

(Document marked "Hoffman Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Are you the person to whom reference was made in the last paragraph?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. And did you speak at the Community Church meeting on that occasion?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you an active member of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I am a very active member of Women Strike for Peace.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. You are a little more than a participant, are you not?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. An active participant, as I said.

Mr. NITTLE. You are in fact a member, or were in fact a member, of the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace and you represent Nassau County, which includes the Long Island area; is that not correct?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. That is correct.

Mr. NITTLE. So that you are a member of the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I said I was.

Mr. NITTLE. The Central Coordinating Committee is the executive group and the policymaking group of Women Strike for Peace, is it not?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Policy is not made by the Coordinating Committee. Actions are planned, discussions are held, communications are passed. Our policy is very simple. It was set up at Ann Arbor during the summer.

Mr. NITTLE. I am not asking you what your policy was.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. But policy, as such, is not set, nor is it changed, by the Central Coordinating Committee. All actions which are planned, are planned within that policy, which is an excellent policy. Most people in our Government subscribe to it, also.

Mr. NITTLE. How was your appointment to the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York organization of Women Strike for Peace effected?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I was not appointed. I heard you read the Structure a short while ago. We have been more or less following that

Structure, which means that from my local community, which is Great Neck, I was asked to represent them in Nassau County, I and some others. At Nassau County some people were chosen to be the representatives to the New York group. Therefore, I am one of the representatives to the New York group.

Mr. NITTLE. What is the title of your local group?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Great Neck Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. That is the group which sent you to the Central Coordinating Committee?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Great Neck Women Strike for Peace. They do excellent work.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the organization of that group?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you form that group in order to form a supporting organization for Mrs. Dagmar Wilson's national group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I did not form that group. I, together with many other women, helped to form that group as part of Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you also engage or participate in the formation of that group in support of the New York organization of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. It didn't quite work out that way. As I recall, the local group—and when I say “group,” you know we have very loose connections, just the telephone connections at the beginning and later we began to meet together in informal ways and it has changed—I believe that the local groups, certainly ours, and most others, began to function in various ways, because all local groups function in their own way and choose their own methods of working. But I believe that the local group began before the New York group. I am not quite certain as to exactly how that operated, but when you are talking about the Central Coordinating Committee that was set up a few months after November 1, which is when we women began to feel that we could do something about war and peace.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. It appears on Posner Exhibit No. 1, that is, the structural plan for Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, a copy of which I hand you, that the Central Coordinating Committee is composed of two representatives from each county or State. However, the structural plan specifically sets forth the area representation as being composed of two representatives, each, from Manhattan, Brooklyn, the Bronx, Queens, Westchester, Long Island, and the States of Connecticut and New Jersey.

It would seem that the New York State representation for the districts named, and to which it is limited, authorizes 12 representatives, whereas the entire States of Connecticut and New Jersey appear to be allowed only two representatives each.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Does that seem unfair? Shall I explain that?

Mr. NITTLE. I wanted to inquire whether there was any reason of policy for limiting the entire States of Connecticut and New Jersey to two delegates each.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. The reasons which I understood, and I did attend one or two of the meetings setting up the Structure—and I may

interject that at these meetings all this was hassled out in about 10 meetings with about 40 women and lots of arguing about each word, so that any gentleman who had any addition would have been lynched—about New Jersey and Connecticut, I would like to say that we consider ourselves the New York Metropolitan area. There are some groups, because of the physical extent of New Jersey and Connecticut, who, if they function as Women Strike for Peace, either function completely independently or are connected with Philadelphia or something like that.

We only take in the Metropolitan area where communication is at all feasible.

Mr. NITTLE. And yet your organization represents itself as speaking for Women Strike for Peace not only for Metropolitan New York, but for the States of Connecticut and New Jersey. Is that not correct?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Theoretically, you are correct, and we do speak for—I don't think we have discussed this before. The other Women Strike for Peace people have never objected and, therefore, it has never been raised. Perhaps it should have been, but the majority of Women Strike people in these two States are in the New York Metropolitan area, so I don't think we are doing a grave injustice though, if we are, it should be corrected.

Mr. NITTLE. It appears further that the representatives on the Central Coordinating Committee have their origin in local groups. I think we have already mentioned the local group of which you are a member. They are authorized to send delegates to the county group level, and the latter group makes the appointments to the Central Coordinating Committee. How many persons compose your local group?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. How many?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, that is, the Great Neck area Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I just repeat again that Women Strike for Peace is not a membership organization, so we do not have members. We have a communication system—

Mr. NITTLE. I asked you how many persons comprise your local group, which you have described as the Great Neck Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I would like to repeat that I don't quite know what you mean by "group." I can explain how we function. I would be glad to. But I don't quite know what you mean by makeup of the group.

The way things happen is that if somebody comes to one of our demonstrations, their name is put on our local membership list and they are notified by phone or by postcard of other activities that they might be interested in. If there are meetings, and the so-called steering committee meetings are open to everyone on the mailing list, and if anyone shows any interest in other aspects, other than demonstrations, in discussions, asks questions, or who would just like to receive anything in the mail, they are put on the mailing list.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me ask you this: Who maintains the mailing list in her possession for the Great Neck Women Strike for Peace? Do you?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I do not. I could not tell you at the moment who does, because whoever is willing to take care of a particular mailing has the mailing list, and it travels from lady to lady. I have no idea who has it at the moment.

Mr. NITTLE. Besides yourself in the Great Neck Women Strike for Peace, how many other women compose or comprise that group, if there are others?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. This is the same question I explained that I could not answer unless you change the wording.

Mr. DOYLE. May I suggest this: I think I heard you say that names were placed on your membership list. I am quite sure I did. Now, about how many names are on that membership list? That will help us.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. If that will help, I can answer that.

Mr. DOYLE. That will help us.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. In our group we have about 375, roughly. It may have gone up since I spoke to you.

Mr. NITTLE. That is, names on your mailing list?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. But these are people you contact when you desire to organize a demonstration, is that right?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. We have two kinds of meetings. There are county meetings. We have, as I said, steering committee meetings, where discussion is held about what we would like to do in our community, how we would like to work with the Metropolitan area, because I must make clear that each group does not always participate when the Metropolitan area makes a decision, and we also have large public meetings—

Mr. NITTLE. To avoid confusion, let me pose this question: When the Great Neck Women Strike for Peace meets, how many women join in that meeting?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I am sorry, sir. I tried explain we have two different types of meetings. We have public meetings, like, generally, luncheons where the ladies come and get dressed up and so forth; or we have work-session meetings, where everyone is free to come, but we don't get quite the turnout for that.

Mr. NITTLE. Let's stop there a moment. Let us talk about the private meetings, which are the work sessions and the organizing sessions. Do you attend those?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Whenever I am able to.

Mr. NITTLE. Where are these work sessions conducted?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. We take turns. Everybody's house.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you held them at your house?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Most likely I have. I don't quite remember.

Mr. NITTLE. It is provided in Posner Exhibit No. 1 that a local group, of which the Great Neck Women Strike for Peace, I presume, is an example, "shall consist of any body of women who have meetings and act in concert for the general purpose of peace."

I assume that this is what you are referring to when you talked about the private meetings, particularly of the work sessions? Is that right?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. You will have to excuse me one minute.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Is that part of the Structure you are reading?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Would you mind either repeating or showing me where it appears?

Mr. NITTLE. You will see it near the top, I think.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. That is correct in that that is how this Structure was passed. As I said at the beginning, this Structure became quite a complicated production, and each group went about things somewhat in their own way, so that, roughly speaking, it was followed, but it was hardly followed to the letter.

Mr. NITTLE. Does your group, the Great Neck Women Strike for Peace, meet the qualifications set up in that limitation of the structural plan?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Yes, sir. We would be considered a local group.

Mr. NITTLE. Has the New York headquarters of Women Strike for Peace established in any official way the number of persons, or the limitation on the number of persons, who will constitute a local group entitled to send representatives to the Central Coordinating Committee?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. No, they have not. Excuse me. The local groups do not send representatives to the Central Coordinating Committee.

Mr. NITTLE. They send representatives to the county groups who select the Central Coordinating Committee representatives?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Now you have it, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. So that the representation of the local group on the county group determines the voting power, doesn't it?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Ostensibly, yes. However, the county meetings have also been—theoretically there should have been two people from each local group. In practice, whoever was interested in coming down, came down and voted. At least, that is true in Nassau County. I cannot speak for the others.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you personally acquainted with Mrs. Dagmar Wilson?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I believe that this committee is infringing upon my rights under the first amendment and for other reasons in asking me to identify any person with whom I have ever associated. I do not see that this committee is authorized to look into the question of my associates and I cannot see that your question is pertinent.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me put it this way: Did you or any person known to you, and to your knowledge, consult or advise with Mrs. Dagmar Wilson concerning the preparation or adoption of the structural plan for your organization, Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey, as set forth in Posner Exhibit No. 1?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. My previous answer stands, but I would like to add, simply for your clarification, that the Metropolitan area drew up this Structure without any assistance from any other area that I am aware of.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the preparation of the plan?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. The Structure plan?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. To a very limited extent.

Mr. NITTLE. I believe you stated that you engaged in debates or discussions upon this proposal.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Yes. As I said, there were many meetings, very lengthy ones, with hassles. One version of the plan was presented and it went back to each group for their corrections and okays, and so forth, and at which time it went back again so that these corrections were incorporated and a final plan emerged.

As I said, many ladies spent endless days and nights on this.

Mr. NITTLE. On an average, how many women met in the discussions on the structural plan to which you are referring?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. As I say, I attended—well, let's see, I remember attending one meeting of about 20 women when they were formulating this at the beginning. Of course, in the local groups where discussion was held, there were many more. Then I must have gone to the Nassau County meetings where this was discussed and I certainly can't remember how many there were. That would be about it. I was not a member of the committee drawing up the Structure plan, I don't think. I know that I did not work on it to the extent that many other women did.

Mr. NITTLE. I repeat the question: Have you discussed the affairs of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace with Mrs. Dagmar Wilson?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. My previous answer to that question stands. I will be glad to reread it, if you wish.

Mr. NITTLE. I ask that there be a direction, Mr. Chairman, that the witness respond to the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct the witness to answer.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I believe—no. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. You did not include in your previous answer any constitutional privileges that would excuse a response to the question.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. In my opinion I did, but I will reread my answer, if you wish.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you simply state the constitutional provision which you invoke?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I said because of my rights under the first amendment and for other reasons. I believe this committee is infringing upon my rights by asking me to identify any person with whom I have ever associated. I do not see that this committee is authorized to look into the question of my associates and I cannot see that your question is pertinent.

Mr. TUCK. Your reasons for not answering the question are not acceptable to the committee. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I make the same instruction, Mrs. Hoffman.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Hoffman, it is the committee's information that in the year 1944 you were a member of the Communist Party in the Brooklyn area. Were you, in 1944, a member of the Communist Party?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I do not see that the committee has the authority to pose this question. I do not believe that past memberships, especially at the date you mentioned, could possibly be pertinent to anything which this committee is authorized to inquire into. I am working for a climate of peace today and I am doing this under no discipline or direction other than that of my own conscience. I have not been—well, that is it, that is my answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer, or shall I repeat it?

Mr. DOYLE. Witness, since you say this question is not pertinent, I want to read one sentence again in my preliminary statement:

The subject of this inquiry is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations * * *.

We frequently have the experience where a person has been a member of the Communist Party, and now and then they come before our committee and say, "Well, I was a member 8, 10, 12 years ago, but I haven't been a member since." Once in a while we find witnesses in that situation acting in the utmost good faith with Congress. We feel it is pertinent to find out in these hearings whether or not any witness before us ever has been and, if they have, are they now.

Many people were Communists at one time and, after a matter of study of philosophies, discovered that it is a conspiracy against our form of government and kick it out of their lives and regret they ever were in it.

Of course, our Supreme Court has held that it is a conspiracy, as I am sure your worthy counsel knows. So I am just raising that thought to you. This is a pertinent question. That is the point I want to make clear to you. It is pertinent to the hearing. I am not asking you, nor did we ask any others, this question to embarrass you. So I instruct you to answer this question.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Gentlemen, I frankly have a very different point of view upon this than you and I am going to answer this question under protest, because I think the reasons for asking are clearly to harass and limit freedom of speech. But I do want to say that I am not now a member of the Communist Party. I have not been a member for more than 5 years. I do not see that any further questions concerning my beliefs previous to this period are pertinent or authorized.

Mr. NITTLE. You state that you——

Mr. DOYLE. In view of my statement to you, may I further state this: We have not been in these hearings, and are not now, interested in motives for people entering the peace movement. We know what the motive of the Communist is in joining the peace movement. It is to help the Communist-outfit conspirators take over the free world. But we don't assign that, as I read, to every member, and naturally not. But I would not have instructed you to answer the question if I didn't feel, as a matter of law, it was pertinent.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I don't quite follow your thinking—if you are interested in my following your thinking—in that whatever you have to say I don't quite see the connection with the peace movement and with today's investigation of the peace movement.

Many of these things that you are discussing here I can't quite see what they have to do with some of the conspiracy charges you and that man over there brought up about, because if the Russians think so, that makes everything bad.

Kennedy believes everything we believe, or he said it, anyhow; and I don't quite follow what you are trying to say to me. I would like to understand.

Mr. DOYLE. I was trying to say to you, and I think I did and I think you got it, that maybe you were a Communist at one time,

but are not now. You have answered that question by saying that you haven't been a Communist for 5 years.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. It was for more than 5 years.

Mr. DOYLE. My question was not erroneous, I find.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I said for more than 5 years. It is just a minor correction.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, for more than 5 years. But somehow I had the idea from what you said in previous testimony that there was a time when you had been one. That is, frankly, why I raised the question. I had what you call a hunch, and your answer, I think, verifies my hunch. But again I want to urge that it is pertinent, because any time we ask a person whether or not he or she is a Communist or has been, it is pertinent under the Supreme Court rulings, we believe, because the Supreme Court has specifically held, a year ago June, in the Subversive Activities Control Board case, that the Communist Party in the United States was and always was, and now is, a conspiracy emanating from a foreign power.

We certainly are legally entitled to ask people whether or not they ever were or are members of an international conspiracy emanating from a foreign power. That was the purport of my question. Thank you for answering.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Hoffman, did you submit your resignation from the Communist Party to a Communist Party functionary?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. You are directed to answer this question. If you have sincerely terminated your membership in the Communist Party and all sympathy with it or for it, you are to be commended. But in the light of your response, that you have not been a member for more than 5 years in the Communist Party, I think it is necessary for the committee to probe your good faith in that statement. I, therefore, think that the question whether you actually submitted a resignation—

Mrs. HOFFMAN. May I answer?

Mr. NITTLE. —is relevant and pertinent to that inquiry.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. My answer is that I do not crawl, but I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I request that the witness be directed to respond to the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I make that direction.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. I think, Mr. Chairman, she should be asked what constitutional privileges she specifically invokes in stating that she stands upon her previous answer in refusing to answer this particular question.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. My privileges were part of my answer, but I will be glad to repeat them. I do not see that the committee has the authority to pose this question. I do not believe that past membership in the Communist Party is pertinent to anything which this committee is authorized to inquire into. I am working for a climate of peace today and I am doing this under no discipline or direction other than that of my own conscience.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. That is it.

Mr. NITTLE. I want to state for the record, Mr. Chairman, and to the witness, that I am not now, nor is the committee now, inquiring into her past membership. The question is posed with a view to determining whether or not there is a present membership in view of your admission of past membership.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I answered that question.

Mr. NITTLE. If there was not a sincere break or termination of membership in the Communist Party and if the resignation was purely technical, there would be a continuing membership. The question is addressed to you with respect to your present membership.

I ask: Did you ever submit a resignation from the Communist Party to a Communist Party functionary?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I would like to repeat what I said to you before, that I am not now a member of the Communist Party. As for the rest of the question, I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. You do not invoke the privileges of the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I do not.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you at any time advise any functionary of the Communist Party of your desire to withdraw from, and break from membership in, the Communist Party?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. To whom did you submit your resignation, if one was submitted?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you at any time publicly announced your withdrawal from the Communist Party?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I have nothing to add to my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you at any time since the date of your alleged withdrawal from the Communist Party conferred with any person known by you to have been a member of the Communist Party or a functionary, prior to the time of your withdrawal, regarding Communist Party objectives?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I don't quite follow what you mean by prior to my withdrawal. Did I consult with them?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. At what period of time?

Mr. NITTLE. Let me put it this way: During the course of your membership in the Communist Party, you, of course, made the acquaintance of other members of the Communist Party; is that not correct, without stating their names?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you at any time since you state you have withdrawn from the Communist Party conferred with any of those persons you then knew, regarding Communist Party objectives?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Does the question mean within the past 5 years have I—

Mr. NITTLE. Since your withdrawal, or since the time you state you have withdrawn.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Have I spoken to any members of the Communist Party.

Mr. NITTLE. Any person you knew to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Regarding Communist Party objectives?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. No. I have not. I have simply discussed with many hundreds of people peace objectives.

Mr. NITTLE. Was your alleged withdrawal from the Communist Party a purely technical one?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any understanding with any Communist Party functionary at the time you stated you withdrew from the party that you would continue to support the party and its policies and objectives?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I stand on my previous answer, though I think I have answered that question in another way.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you become an anti-Communist after you left the party?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. Let me caution the witness.

I call to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that the witness said to her attorney, "How do I answer that question?" Our rules specifically provide that the answers of the witness to questions are to be the witness' answers and not her attorney's. His function is to advise as to constitutional rights.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I need advice as to time.

Mr. NITTLE. But not as to the language that shall be the response to the question.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. I ask that counsel for Mrs. Hoffman be advised against that practice.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. HOFFMAN. I would like to have a few things clarified, which is why I asked my attorney. I thought he understood more than I did, but he is confused, also. Perhaps if you restated your question so that I knew you would be discussing my points of view during the past 5 years, and then perhaps if you could clarify what you mean by an anti-Communist, because very many people have very different ideas about what either a Communist or an anti-Communist is, then perhaps I might be able to answer that.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Hoffman, it seems that the question is perfectly clear, and we will entertain whatever response you wish to give to it. You may qualify your response in whatever way you see fit.

I ask you again: Have you become an anti-Communist since your alleged date of withdrawal from the party, more than 5 years ago?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. Then I am to understand you are discussing—you are asking me about my thinking during the past 5 years as regards communism? Do I understand that correctly?

Mr. NITTLE. I am asking whether you have become an anti-Communist since your withdrawal from the party.

Mrs. HOFFMAN. And I tell you again, I cannot answer that question unless you more clearly define it.

Mr. NITTLE. Is that your answer?

Mrs. HOFFMAN. That is my answer. I don't understand your question.

Mr. NITTLE. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we recess the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. The public hearings will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning in this room.

(Whereupon, at 1:05 p.m., Tuesday, December 11, 1962, the public hearings were recessed, to be resumed at 10 a.m. on the following day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1962

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session at 2:45 p.m., in Room 219, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Subcommittee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle, of California, and William M. Tuck, of Virginia.

Staff members present: Francis J. McNamara, director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Raymond T. Collins, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. Mrs. Neidenberg, will you please raise your right hand and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you. Please be seated.

TESTIMONY OF ELSIE NEIDENBERG, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Elsie Neidenberg, 250 Central Avenue, Lawrence, Long Island, New York.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you at any time previously resided at 389 Mulry Lane, Hempstead, Long Island?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I never resided in Hempstead.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you resided in the area of Long Island?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Yes, I have.

Mr. NITTLE. Where in Long Island did you reside and would you state the time or period of your residence?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Well, possibly I could clarify something so we won't have to go into this. Mulry Lane happens to be in Lawrence, also, and I did live at 389 Mulry Lane. It was not in Hempstead. I mean I feel we go through a lot of questions which may just not get us anywhere on this.

Mr. NITTLE. That was Mulry Lane, Lawrence, Long Island?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. That's right.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I was born in Moscow, Russia, February 2, 1918.

¹ Released by the committee and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Could I be identified on the record?

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel please identify himself for the record, stating his name and office address?

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you presently a citizen of the United States?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Yes I am, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state for the record when and by what process you acquired citizenship?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Sometime in 1928 under my father's papers.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. High school graduate.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you Mrs. Louis Neidenberg?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Presently I am a housewife and mother. I also do several other things like work in the hospital to help the needy and those that are ill. I help the women in the Golden Age Club, and actually this is my current occupation, as a volunteer, I might add.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a member of an organization known as Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer this and invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment and I also feel that this question has no pertinency, nor does this committee have the authority under the inquiries that they should be making, I guess I should say, and to answer this question would be an infringement on my constitutional rights.

Mr. NITTLE. When you state that you are invoking the fifth amendment, do you invoke the self-incrimination clause of that amendment?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Well, if it is needed in this instance I am.

Mr. NITTLE. The question is, Are you presently invoking it?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Yes, I am.

Mr. NITTLE. You must make the decision as to whether it is needed.

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Yes, I am. I feel, considering the presentation that was made at the open hearing this morning, that I would have to invoke this privilege.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you feel that if you were to answer this particular question it might subject you to a criminal prosecution?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I believe so.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Neidenberg, it is the committee's information that on January 22, 1962, a meeting took place of the officers and members of a New York group of the Women Strike for Peace organization, at which a report was made by the chairman of the Finance Committee, who reported, among other things, on the amount collected for train fares to transport Women Strike for Peace demonstrators to Washington for the White House picketing demonstration on January 15, 1962.

It is the committee's information that you were in attendance at that meeting of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace. Did you, in fact, attend that meeting?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I stand on the previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. It was also reported at that meeting that \$18,974.91 had been collected for the stated purpose of conducting the picketing demonstration at the White House. Do you recall that report?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I stand on the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Also at that meeting the then treasurer submitted her resignation, whereupon you, Elsie Neidenberg, and two other persons volunteered to serve as co-treasurers. Would you tell the committee whether this information is correct?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer this and invoke my privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. While you have served as co-treasurer, have any funds of the New York group been forwarded for the use of the Washington headquarters of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I must decline to answer this for the same reason.

Mr. NITTLE. During your tenure as co-treasurer, has any financial report ever been rendered by your organization to the Washington headquarters of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Since I have laid no claim to any organization, I must again decline to answer this question and invoke my privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you take part in the White House demonstrations in Washington on January 15, 1962?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that approximately 1,700 women participated in the White House demonstration on January 15, 1962. Approximately 1,450 of the 1,700 women arrived by train on the Pennsylvania Railroad, and several women of your New York group visited various congressional offices during the afternoon of that day. It appears that the vast majority of the women who demonstrated before the White House were from the New York area rather than from the Washington area, which is the headquarters of Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. May I just speak to Mr. Taylor?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you tell us how many fares were purchased by the New York group for transportation to the Washington demonstration?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. NITTLE. Were not approximately 1,450 fares purchased from the Pennsylvania Railroad?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer for the stated reason.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you have any knowledge as to whether or not there was any coordination on this occasion between the New York group of Women Strike for Peace and the Washington headquarters of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I invoke the same privilege.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of the organizational plan previously marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 1, titled "Structure for Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan N.Y. New Jersey Conn." You will note on page 3 of that exhibit there are established certain work committees, among which appears the Finance Committee, consisting of a chairman pro tem and three

treasurers, together with accountants, fund raisers, and so forth. When you volunteered on January 22, 1962, to serve as co-treasurer, had Posner Exhibit 1 been adopted as the official plan of organization of your group, Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I stand on the fifth amendment, my privilege not to answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you presently serving in the capacity of co-treasurer of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that an Elsie Neidenberg, then of 389 Mulry Lane, Lawrence, Hempstead, Long Island, on August 27, 1946, signed a Communist Party Independent Nominating Petition for the New York election. I hand you a photostatic copy of that petition, marked for identification as Neidenberg Exhibit No. 1, upon which the signature of Elsie Neidenberg appears.

Are you the Elsie Neidenberg whose signature appears upon that petition?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I don't see the pertinency of this question to any inquiry the committee is authorized to make, and to be required to answer is an infringement of my constitutional rights.

(Document marked "Neidenberg Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. You will note that the petition states in its printed form that—

I intend to support at the ensuing election, and I do hereby nominate the following named persons as candidates * * * and that I select the name COMMUNIST PARTY as the name of the independent body making the nominations * * *.

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I again state that I don't see the pertinency of this question to the inquiry and I decline to answer and invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you executed that petition?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer and give the same reasons.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Same answer. I cannot answer and I invoke my privilege.

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel, are you going to state to the witness the pertinency of that question? She has raised that point.

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I must say, Mr. Doyle, if I may, that I heard the open hearings this morning and I heard what both you and the counsel here had to say, but I still don't see or didn't feel that, in this particular instance where I am concerned, what I may or may not have done has anything to do with the peace movement today, if this is what the inquiry is about.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand then that you don't think that whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party is pertinent to our hearings?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I don't think so and I also, as I said, take the privilege of the fifth amendment not to testify against myself at the same time.

Mr. DOYLE. Having explained to you, or raised for your further information, why I feel that the question is pertinent, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Well, I decline to answer on my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Neidenberg, the Hewlett-Woodmere Library is situated in Cedarhurst, Long Island; is it not?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. No, it is not.

Mr. NITTLE. Where is it situated?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. In Woodmere.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you participated in any of the activities of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy during the year 1961?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer this question for the same reason.

* * * * *

Mr. DOYLE. Why is that question pertinent?

Mr. NITTLE. To the activities of Mrs. Neidenberg in the so-called peace movement.

Mr. DOYLE. I will instruct you to answer, Mrs. Neidenberg.

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer that under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

* * * * *

Mr. NITTLE. During the period of your service as co-treasurer of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace, have you solicited or received funds from persons known by you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I decline to answer this and invoke my privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you communicated to any person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party any information relative to the financial status of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I must decline to answer this for the same reason.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you engage in activities in Women Strike for Peace on behalf of the Communist Party?

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. I must decline to answer that though I can't see the relevancy of this question, but I will decline to answer and invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Governor Tuck?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions. Thank you, witness.

Mrs. NEIDENBERG. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Will the next witness, Mrs. Sylvia Contente, please rise and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you. Please be seated.

TESTIMONY OF SYLVIA CONTENTE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your name and residence for the record, please?

Mrs. CONTENTE. My name is Sylvia Contente. I live at 1306 Fteley Avenue. I will spell it for you. That's F-t-e-l-e-y, in the Bronx.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I think I am very ably represented by counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly state his name and office address for the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you, Mrs. Contente, formerly reside at 2965 East 196th Street, New York City?

Mrs. CONTENTE. May I speak to my counsel?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CONTENTE. Yes, I did.

Mr. NITTLE. And did you also reside at one time at 1063 Ward Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.?

Mrs. CONTENTE. Yes, I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you Mrs. Ira Contente?

Mrs. CONTENTE. That's right, I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Mrs. CONTENTE. May 3, 1919, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I am a high school graduate. I graduated from Theodore Roosevelt High School in the Bronx.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. CONTENTE. Do you want to know how I spend my time? I have a job in an office. This is the way I supplement our income, but beside that I devote a great deal of time in all my community activities. I am president of a parents association. I am a board member of a settlement house and various and sundry organizations in my community.

Mr. NITTLE. What is the nature of your employment?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I just work in an office. I do bookkeeping.

Mr. NITTLE. I believe you are also a member, or were, of the Bronx chapter of the American Association for the United Nations?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CONTENTE. Yes, that's true.

Mr. NITTLE. You were relating some of your activities, and I just wanted to determine whether my information relating to them is correct.

Mrs. CONTENTE. All this is public record, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I made no imputation that it wasn't.

Mrs. CONTENTE. All right. I'm sorry.

Mr. NITTLE. I don't recollect whether you mentioned membership on the board of the Bronx River Neighborhood Center.

Mrs. CONTENTE. That's the settlement house I was referring to.

Mr. NITTLE. I see. Are you also the chairman of two public school parent associations?

Mrs. CONTENTE. Not simultaneously. I was at one time at one school and I am at the present time president of a parent association, yes. I don't think I could do that.

Mr. NITTLE. What school is that, if I may ask?

Mrs. CONTENTE. It's Junior High School 123, Bronx.

Mr. NITTLE. I believe you are also engaged and occupied as a member of a New York group of Women Strike for Peace, are you not?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CONTENTE. Well, I would like to answer your question by indicating that I don't feel that your question is really pertinent to this inquiry, whether or not I do participate with Women Strike for Peace, and I really question the validity of your authority under which you ask this question.

Mr. NITTLE. You heard the chairman's opening statement, I presume, this morning?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I certainly did. In fact I read it before.

Mr. NITTLE. This is the organization to which he referred and which is the subject of inquiry.

Mrs. CONTENTE. I realize that.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question? I wondered this morning—and I intended to ask the question of one or more of the women on the stand—You are all very proud of your community work and your PTA and United Nations work and list those proudly, and that's right, but when you come to the Women Strike for Peace you plead the fifth amendment. What is there about the Women Strike for Peace that makes you unwilling to tell us about it? What does it do? What is there about it? What is the distinction? What is there about the Women Strike for Peace that you don't want the Congress to know anything about as far as you are concerned?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CONTENTE. Mr. Doyle, it isn't that I don't want you to know about it, and, as you indicated yourself, we are very proud of our activities. All of the activities are public record.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mrs. CONTENTE. But we feel that as American citizens the question relating to this loosely organized movement is not pertinent.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then why are questions related to the PTA pertinent? I was once president of the PTA of the men years ago. Why are questions about the PTA, about the United Nations, about the community settlement pertinent?

Mrs. CONTENTE. Sir, you are not concerned with the kind of work or kind of activity that the other organizations we mentioned discuss. You just want to know something about me as an individual, I gather. That's why you are interested for the record to know what my community connections are in relation to your statement this morning—I am concerned with the pertinency of Women Strike for Peace, looking for subversive people in the group, being directed by a foreign government—and I feel that under those circumstances I have to decline to answer because I must take the fifth amendment and guard myself against incriminating myself.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you are quite right. Our questions are intended to be limited to the extent to which subversives are infiltrating the Women Strike for Peace. We are not concerned with your motives or anything of the sort. We are concerned with, and, as I said, you heard my statement this morning, the extent to which the Communists as subversives are infiltrating, if they are, the Women Strike for Peace. Is that the reason you plead the fifth amendment?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CONTENTE. I have to stand on my previous answer, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't mean to try to lead you out.

Mrs. CONTENTE. I realize that.

Mr. DOYLE. But it was very surprising to me. There must be something about the Women Strike for Peace that the women don't want Congress to know about.

Mrs. CONTENTE. I am not here to make any speeches, but I feel that the emphasis is on the wrong thing entirely. It isn't that we don't want you to know, because if the women who participate, or who are concerned with the questions involved, didn't want anyone to know, all this information would not be public.

We are concerned that we don't invade anyone's privacy of thought and we don't want anyone harassed and we don't want to be involved in the situation where we have to become informers on other people who may or may not be—I have no idea—and I cannot under those circumstances do anything else except take the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. I understand I think. Thank you. Pardon me, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Contente, we are principally concerned with the activities of certain persons which are not so public in Women Strike for Peace, and I think you might have gathered that from the interrogation of prior witnesses.

Mrs. CONTENTE. Yes, I did. I listened very intently.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that you were a member of a delegation organized by the New York group of Women Strike for Peace which departed from Idlewild Airport on April 1, 1962, to attend the disarmament conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Were you a member of the delegation and did you attend the Geneva conference?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I am afraid, sir, that based on what I said before regarding the pertinency of this question, I have to decline to answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you personally assume the expenses of your travel to Geneva?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I think the same answer will have to prevail.

Mr. NITTLE. Were any part of the expenses of travel to Geneva assumed by the New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I will have to give you the same answer, take the fifth amendment, to avoid any self-incrimination.

Mr. NITTLE. Could you tell us whether the New York group of Women Strike for Peace initiated the arrangements for the appearance of a delegation at Geneva on behalf of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I believe, sir, that I will have to give you the same answer.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information, Mrs. Contente, that you, together with your husband, Ira Contente, giving your address as 1063 Ward Avenue, Bronx, New York, in 1946 signed a Communist Party Independent Nominating Petition for Robert Thompson, a leading Communist Party functionary who sought the office of Governor of the State of New York.

There were other Communist Party candidates on the petition. I hand you a photostatic copy of that petition, which is titled "Communist Party Independent Nominating Petition." The signature of Sylvia Contente appears thereon under date of August 17, 1946.

Are you the Sylvia Contente who executed that Communist Party nominating petition?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I am going to have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. NITTLE. On what grounds?

Mrs. CONTENTE. On the grounds of the fifth amendment, on the constitutional ground of the fifth amendment.

(Document marked "Contente Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. I point out to you that the petition is addressed to the Secretary of State of the State of New York and declares that the undersigned persons, among whom the name "Sylvia Contente" appears, executing that petition are duly qualified voters, that they intend to support at the ensuing election the persons nominated as candidates in that petition, and select the name "Communist Party" as the name of the independent body making the nominations.

Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you executed that petition?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I must decline to answer because I don't believe the question is pertinent to these hearings and I again have to say that I question the authority of the committee to ask me these questions and I will decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer the question, Witness. It is very pertinent.

Mrs. CONTENTE. I decline to answer on the constitutional grounds of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, Mrs. Contente?

Mrs. CONTENTE. My answer is exactly the same, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer that question.

Mrs. CONTENTE. You want me to say that again? Well, I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Contente, I think I will possibly ask you another question or two and then conclude the staff interrogation.

An organization titled "American Youth for Democracy" was formed in October 1943 to succeed the Young Communist League upon the dissolution of the latter organization. It is the committee's information that you attended a State convention of the American Youth for Democracy held at the Hotel Diplomat in New York City on December 14, 15, and 16, 1945; that you were a member of the Finance Committee of that organization, elected to the State Council on behalf of the Bronx young adult group.

Were you in attendance at that convention?

Mrs. CONTENTE. I am sorry, Counsel, but I will have to give you the same answer as I did before.

Mr. NITTLE. Had you been a member of the Young Communist League?

Mrs. CONTENTE. The same answer prevails.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in your activities on behalf of Women Strike for Peace, including your membership in the delegation to the Geneva conference, as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. CONTENTE. My answer is the same, sir. I decline to answer under the constitutional fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you counseled and advised by any member of the Communist Party to undertake activities in Women Strike for Peace and other peace organizations?

Mrs. CONTENTE. My answer has to be the same, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the staff has no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions, Counsel.

Thank you, Witness.

(Whereupon, at 3:30 p.m., Tuesday, December 11, 1962, the subcommittee, in executive session, adjourned, subject to call.)

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

(Women Strike for Peace and Certain Other Groups)

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1962

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D.C.
PUBLIC HEARINGS

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:15 a.m., in the Caucus Room, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Subcommittee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle, of California; William M. Tuck, of Virginia; and Donald C. Bruce, of Indiana.

Staff members present: Alfred M. Nittle, counsel, and Raymond T. Collins, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. The subcommittee will please come to order.

The subcommittee will proceed.

Governor Tuck, former Governor of Virginia, and myself, Clyde Doyle of California, are now present. Therefore, a quorum of the subcommittee is present.

We will proceed with the hearings this morning.

Yesterday I read the preliminary statement. I will not read it this morning unless there is some request from counsel for some of the witnesses that I do so. I will assume that all the witnesses today were here yesterday and heard that read. We know that the legal counsel appearing for the witnesses today is familiar with it.

Are you ready, Counsel?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Before you call your first witness, I have a statement I wish to read with reference to an incident yesterday.

At the close of the hearing yesterday, a news reporter inquired if I had made a statement during the course of the hearings, to the effect that the burden of proof was on the witness to show she was not a member of the Communist Party. I denied making any such statement. I made that denial because I do not and never have believed that, as all who know me can verify. Of course, the burden of proof is not on the witness to show that she was not a member of the Communist Party. This is the position I have always taken on this committee and in my law practice.

This morning, to my amazement on examination of the transcript of the testimony, I find that I am reported as having made the following statement:

So far as we know, she is a Communist now, because there is no evidence that she is not. If she is not, here is an opportunity for her to clear it up.

During the verbal extemporaneous exchange I was having with the witness, I no doubt stated what I was reported to have stated, but I did not intend to leave the impression that I believed then or now that a witness is under the burden of proving that she is not a member of the Communist Party, as that is, in fact, contrary to my opinion, and my expressions on this subject over a term of years are well known.

Are you ready, Mr. Nittle?

MR. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

MR. DOYLE. Call your first witness, please.

MR. NITTLE. Would Rose Clinton please come forward?

(A bouquet was handed to Miss Clinton by one of the spectators.)

MR. DOYLE. It is nice to get the flowers while you can smell them, isn't it?

Well, I am sure we all enjoyed that courtesy extended to the witness by her friends. I think it is the first time in all the years that I have been on the committee that I have seen it done, but we are glad you got a bouquet.

That causes me just to make this remark. I couldn't help but notice yesterday, when a portion of the audience stood up, you all stood up simultaneously, which was interesting. Both sides of the dividing aisle seemed to know when it was your time to stand up.

Now, of course, there is only one way you could know that, because that was planned.

The other thing I noticed was, when the same group applauded, you all applauded, beginning simultaneously. And of course, to me, having observed those things before, that means that that was planned.

So let's not have any repetition of that sort of planned demonstration today. Let's not have that occur, please, because it is too evident, don't you see, to those that are not doing it.

Witness, will you please stand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MISS CLINTON. I do.

MR. DOYLE. You may proceed, Counsel.

TESTIMONY OF ROSE CLINTON, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

MR. NITTLE. Would you state your name and residence, please?

MISS CLINTON. Rose Clinton, New York City.

MR. NITTLE. What is your street address?

MISS CLINTON. 370 West 58th.

MR. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel, Mrs. Clinton?

MISS CLINTON. Yes.

MR. NITTLE. Would counsel please identify himself for the record, stating his name and office address?

MR. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your marital status, Mrs. Clinton?

Miss CLINTON. It is Miss Clinton.

Mr. NITTLE. It is Miss Clinton?

Miss CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Where were you born, and when?

Miss CLINTON. I was born in Virginia, and I am very much surprised to see Governor Tuck here.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the place of your birth in the State of Virginia?

Miss CLINTON. Clinton's Point, Va.

Mr. NITTLE. Now you did not give us the date of your birth. Do you wish to limit your testimony in that respect, stating that you are over 21 years of age?

Miss CLINTON. I do, and as a lady from the South, I don't like to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, in view of your observation about the distinguished former Governor of Virginia being a member of this committee, and present, I will say that not only the committee, but the whole Congress, is very proud and happy to have him as a Member of Congress.

Mr. NITTLE. Miss Clinton, would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Miss CLINTON. I have a high school education and a college education.

Mr. NITTLE. What college did you attend and would you state whether you received any degree?

Miss CLINTON. George Washington University.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you receive a degree from George Washington University and, if so, would you state what that degree is?

Miss CLINTON. I received an LL.B. degree.

Mr. NITTLE. A bachelor of laws degree.

What is your present occupation?

Miss CLINTON. I am self-employed. I have no particular occupation. I am a free-lance stenographer.

Mr. NITTLE. What is the place of your occupation?

Miss CLINTON. I work from home.

Mr. NITTLE. The committee's investigation discloses that you have been very active in an organization known as the West Side Peace Committee and that you have assumed the position of secretary thereof and membership chairman.

Are you presently the secretary and membership chairman of the West Side Peace Committee?

Miss CLINTON. I question the committee's authority under the Constitution to require me to answer that question, and I question its pertinence to any matter the committee is authorized to inquire into.

Mr. NITTLE. What constitutional privilege do you invoke in response to the question?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. I think we should clarify that.

Do you invoke the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment of the Constitution as a basis for your refusal to respond to the question?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. Do I understand that you are directing me to answer that question?

Mr. NITTLE. I have asked for your basis for refusal to respond to the question.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. And I ask specifically whether you are invoking the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Miss CLINTON. I still stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the witness' response, I respectfully request that she be directed to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer that question, Witness, and may I ask that you speak a little louder? There is still a little noise in the hearing room, and the committee cannot quite hear everything you say. But if you heard the counsel's question to you—did you hear his question to you?

Miss CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer that question.

Miss CLINTON. In that event, I must also invoke my constitutional privilege under the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you tell us how the West Side Peace Committee came into existence? And how you were appointed to, or assumed the position of, secretary and membership chairman of that committee?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Miss Clinton, in the course of the Senate investigation of a New York group designated the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Henry Abrams, a prominent leader of that group and the unpublicized chief organizer of its May 1960 Madison Square Garden Rally, was revealed as a Communist and expelled from the national organization of SANE in January 1961.

He thereafter formed an organization titled the "Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups" and served as its chairman.

The Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups established executive officers and an executive committee for the coordination of supporting local neighborhood groups.

It is the committee's information that you, Rose Clinton, were one of the initial members of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups.

Do you affirm or deny this assertion of fact?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. I still stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups established no office, but utilized a mailing and telephone service at 550 Fifth Avenue, Manhattan, New York.

Would you corroborate that information for the benefit of the committee?

Miss CLINTON. I still stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. It is also our information that the West Side Peace Committee is one of the neighborhood groups established and operating in support of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups.

Was the West Side Peace Committee established as a supporting group for the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups?

Miss CLINTON. I question the committee's authority to ask the question and I stand on my previous response.

Mr. NITTLE. It is further our information that the West Side Peace Committee has been scheduled to meet monthly, with featured speakers; that this group had recently a paid-up membership of approximately 95 persons and maintained a mailing list of approximately 800 persons; and that the West Side Peace Committee maintains a representative on the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups.

Could you as secretary of the West Side Peace Committee corroborate this information?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know Henry Abrams, the chairman of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Miss CLINTON. Previous answer.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask again, please, that you speak a little louder?

Miss CLINTON. I am sorry.

Mr. DOYLE. Speak right into the mouthpiece, there.

Miss CLINTON. I have stage fright.

Mr. NITTLE. Does the West Side Peace Committee presently maintain any offices and, if so, would you state the office address?

Miss CLINTON. I invoke the right to stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. It is our information that the West Side Peace Committee maintains no office except an address at the personal residence of one Ceil Gross, at 145 West 96th Street, Apartment 10-A, New York City; telephone RI 9-0506.

Is that the official address of the West Side Peace Committee?

Miss CLINTON. My answer is the same.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you perform your duties as secretary at the residence of Ceil Gross?

Miss CLINTON. My answer is the same.

Mr. NITTLE. At what place does your organization, the West Side Peace Committee, maintain its mailing list of approximately 800 persons?

Miss CLINTON. Same.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask that you be a little bit more explicit, instead of just saying "same"?

Miss CLINTON. I shall repeat what I said before. I question—

Mr. DOYLE. That will be unnecessary, if you will just say "the same as my previous answer."

Miss CLINTON. Thank you. The same as my previous answer.

Mr. DOYLE. If you will just say that, instead of just the word "same."

Miss CLINTON. Thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you appointed to the position of secretary and membership chairman of the West Side Peace Committee by any person known to be a member of the Communist Party?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. The same. My answer is the same as the previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Miss Clinton, on July 11, 1951, Mrs. Mary Stalcup Markward, who had been an undercover operative for the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 1943 to 1949, serving in the Communist

Party of the District of Columbia, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that in the spring of 1949 she met with you at a secret Communist Party meeting in Baltimore, Md.

Was Mrs. Markward correct in stating your attendance at that secret Communist Party meeting in Baltimore?

Miss CLINTON. My answer is the same as the previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. You have formerly resided in the city of Washington, D.C., have you not?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you state the period of time during which you resided here?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. I give the same answer as the previous one.

Mr. NITTLE. You are invoking the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment?

Miss CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. On May 4, 1953, Mrs. Dorothy K. Funn, F-u-n-n, formerly a school teacher from Brooklyn, N.Y., testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities that she joined the Communist Party in May 1939 and remained a member until about June 1946.

During the period from 1943 to 1946, she was assigned to Washington, D.C., as a legislative representative for the National Negro Congress, an organization cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark.

She further testified that she met periodically in Washington with secret cells of the Communist Party composed of legislative representatives here for certain organizations and others.

She testified that she knew you as a member of the Communist Party and that you were then employed in Washington, D.C., by the Cafeteria Workers Union, CIO.

Did Mrs. Funn correctly describe you as a member of the Communist Party during that period?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you sincerely believe that an answer to that question would subject you to a criminal prosecution?

Miss CLINTON. I invoke my constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you participated in any of the activities of a New York group of Women-Strike for Peace?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a member of Women Strike for Peace?

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you in attendance during the interrogation of the prior witnesses, Blanche H. Posner and Lyla Hoffman, yesterday?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you had occasion to discuss with Blanche H. Posner any of the activities of the West Side Peace Committee?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you had occasion to discuss with Lyla Hoffman any of the activities of the West Side Peace Committee, of which you are the secretary and membership chairman?

Miss CLINTON. The same as the previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of page 11 of a newspaper called the *National Guardian*, issue of January 15, 1962, marked for identification as Clinton Exhibit No. 1.

I direct your attention to an advertisement on page 11 under a column designated "CALENDAR." Under the subheading "NEW YORK" appears the following:

TUES., JAN. 16, 8:15 p.m. Panel Discussion: FALLOUT SHELTERS—DEFENSE OR DELUSION? Mrs. Mary Sharmat, Women's Strike for Peace; Dr. Alex Mauro, scientists' Comm. for Radiation Information; Dr. Doris K. Miller, psychologist; Senator Manfred Ohrenstein. Panel discussion followed by question-and-answer period.—Hotel Beacon, 75 & B'way. Auspices: West Side Peace Committee.

Did you participate in the arrangements made for the appearance of the speaker from the New York group of the organization known as Women Strike for Peace at the Hotel Beacon?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss CLINTON. My answer is the same as the previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you communicate with the speaker for Women Strike for Peace by mail or otherwise for this purpose?

Miss CLINTON. My answer is the same.

Mr. NITTLE. The advertisement indicates that the panel discussion was conducted under the auspices of the West Side Peace Committee, as I have said, and that the panel discussion was on the following subject: "Fallout shelters, defense or delusion?"

Did you participate in the selection or designation of this subject for discussion?

Miss CLINTON. My answer is the same as the previous.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you under the discipline of the Communist Party while undertaking such activities on behalf of the West Side Peace Committee?

Miss CLINTON. The same answer.

(Document marked "Clinton Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the staff interrogation.

Mr. DOYLE. Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions except to ask you, Counsel: You have produced a document there in evidence. May I see that?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What publication is this? What organization publishes this paper?

Mr. NITTLE. This is the *National Guardian*, a newspaper cited in our *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications*, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Very well.

That is all, Counsel. Thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Would Iris Freed come forward?

(At this point Mr. Bruce entered the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. May the record of the hearings show that Donald Bruce, of Indiana, a member of the subcommittee duly appointed, takes a seat on the subcommittee for these hearings at this time.

Will the witness please stand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. FREED. I do.

TESTIMONY OF IRIS FREED, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mrs. FREED. Iris Freed, 15 Douglas Lane, Larchmont, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, I am. Mr. Telford Taylor is representing me.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself for the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Is Larchmont situated in the county of Westchester, State of New York?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, it is.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you formerly reside at 659 Pennsylvania Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the period of your residence there?

Mrs. FREED. Pardon me.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. That is so long ago, let me think a moment, please.

Mr. NITTLE. Was it in the 1940's?

Mrs. FREED. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Mrs. FREED. It was New York City and—it was Brooklyn, N.Y., I am sorry—January 20, 1920.

Mr. NITTLE. You are Mrs. Selwyn Freed, are you not?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, I am.

Mr. NITTLE. That is S-e-l-w-y-n?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Was your maiden name Iris Schwartz?

Mrs. FREED. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. FREED. High school, Girls' Commercial High School.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. FREED. I am a housewife and a mother of two children.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a member of an organization known as Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. FREED. Women Strike for Peace is not an organization. It is a movement.

Mr. NITTLE. Does it have members?

Mrs. FREED. No, it does not.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, Mrs. Freed, that is interesting. If a group has no organization and has no members, how in the world does it function?

Mrs. FREED. Well, it is quite remarkable. Sometimes I wonder, myself.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, it has appeared to me quite remarkable, too.

But as a matter of fact, Women Strike for Peace is organized; isn't it?

Mrs. FREED. I am sorry. I don't understand your question. What do you mean? It is not an organization.

Mr. NITTLE. Well, let me put it this way. You do have in the New York group of that organization a body known as the Central Coordinating Committee, do you not?

Mrs. FREED. We just—it is—well, there are some people in New York, yes, and it is called the Coordinating Committee, except the Coordinating Committee consists of many people. It is not just in New York.

Mr. NITTLE. How many people does it consist of?

Mrs. FREED. Oh, it is so fluid it is hard to say.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Freed, as a matter of fact, the Central Coordinating Committee does not consist of many people, does it?

Mrs. FREED. To my knowledge it does, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, I hand you a copy of Posner Exhibit No. 1, the structural plan for Women Strike for Peace for New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

Mr. NITTLE. I presume you are familiar with that structural plan, are you not?

Mrs. FREED. Somewhat.

Mr. NITTLE. Well now, you are actually a member of the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. FREED. No, I am not. I am not.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you not appointed as a Westchester delegate to the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. FREED. You know, it is very funny. You make us sound really so organized, and we are not. I went from Westchester a number of times—not all of the times—mostly through default because nobody else could go or was available, but it was never anything, you know, specific.

Mr. NITTLE. You do not wish to be specific on the subject. Is that right?

Mrs. FREED. No, I can't be. It isn't that I don't want to be. There is nothing specific to say about it. I haven't always been there. (At this point Mr. Tuck left the hearing room.)

Mr. NITTLE. The structural plan does establish a representation and fixes the number of persons who serve on the Central Coordinating Committee.

I direct your attention to page 1 of that exhibit, where it is stated:

The Central Coordinating Committee, then, is composed of two representatives from each County or State (Manhattan, Brooklyn, Bronx, Queens, Westchester, Long Island, Connecticut and New Jersey)

Mrs. FREED. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE (continuing).

plus one representative from each Work Committee * * * plus the N.Y. Office Coordinator.

The representation of the New York group on the Central Coordinating Committee consists, then, of 12 representatives. Two representatives, each, from Connecticut and from New Jersey are also allowed. That is a body of 16 representatives, excluding, of course, the membership of the representative from each work committee and the office coordinator. Is that correct?

Mrs. FREED. Well, it so states here, but this isn't what always happened. There were many people there, sometimes, you know, double the amount, because we didn't follow a structure that rigidly, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Blanche Posner was reported in the *New York Times* as being the office chairman pro tem of that group, and it was stated that she spent many hours a day in the office. Do you have knowledge of that fact?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. There are no officers in Women Strike for Peace, but I question your constitutional authority to require me to answer that question and I also question its pertinency to any matter that this subcommittee is authorized to inquire about. For that reason I have already stated, I am invoking my constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment and must decline to answer that.

Mr. NITTLE. When you invoke your constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment, are you invoking the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. The clause that requires that I need not be a witness against myself.

Mr. DOYLE. May I inquire at that point, Do you really believe that if you answered that question without claiming your constitutional privilege that it might submit you to criminal prosecution?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. Insofar as any other individual is concerned, I rely on my previous statement, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I have the answer? I did not quite hear.

Mrs. FREED. Insofar as any other individual is concerned, I rely on my previous statement.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I respectfully suggest I do not think you have answered my question.

I asked you whether or not you really believe if you answered that question truthfully, without claiming your constitutional privilege, it would submit you to criminal prosecution. Now that can be answered, I think, "yes" or "no," and should be so answered, as I understand it.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I am claiming my constitutional privilege insofar as anybody else is concerned, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. FREED. I stand on my previous statement, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. This article from the Mount Vernon, N.Y., *Daily Argus* of January 12, 1962, which we have marked for identification as Freed Exhibit No. 1, a copy of which I hand you, reports Mrs. Selwyn Freed as being a Westchester community chairman of an organization titled "Women for Peace."

Are you the Mrs. Selwyn Freed to which this article refers?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, I am.

(Document marked "Freed Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a Westchester community chairman of the Westchester Women for Peace, as reported?

Mrs. FREED. We don't have any chairman, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Well, then, you dispute the newspaper account of your position with that group? We would like to give you an opportunity to correct it, if an error has been made.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. Well, I—I think the statement is erroneous here in the paper. I would like to correct it. We don't have chairmen as such, and if they call me a chairman, this is not true.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, if one were to call white, black, would it still be white or black?

Mrs. FREED. There is no pertinence to that question, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Women for Peace and Women Strike for Peace are one and the same organization. Is that not correct?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. What was your answer?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I turn to another organization for a moment, previously referred to in the interrogation of the prior witness, Miss Clinton. An organization entitled "Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups," conducted a meeting at Carnegie Hall on May 12, 1961, with Linus Pauling as a principal speaker. It is the committee's information that you participated in that affair. Did you?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. Yes, I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know Henry Abrams, chairman of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups?

Mrs. FREED. I question your constitutional authority to require me to answer that question, and I also question its pertinence to any matter that this subcommittee is authorized to inquire about.

For these reasons, the reasons already stated, I am invoking my constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment and I must decline to answer that.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of the Communist newspaper, the *Sunday Worker*, dated August 17, 1941, published in New York, marked for identification as Freed Exhibit No. 2.

I direct your attention to page 5, where appears a photograph of two women in the upper left-hand corner. Do you appear as the woman on the left? And are you the Iris Schwartz referred to in that account?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I question your constitutional authority to require me to answer that question, and I also question its pertinence to any matter that this subcommittee is authorized to inquire about. For that reason already stated, I am invoking my constitutional privilege on the fifth amendment.

(Document marked "Freed Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. The caption of the photograph which appears in that publication is "They Work To Build Their Union," and at the bottom of the photograph there appears the legend:

Iris Schwartz (left) works a mimeograph machine while Betty Miller runs an addressograph at Department Store Employees Union, 151 W. 33rd St.

Do you operate a mimeograph machine?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. Do you mean do I now, sir? Do you mean do I now operate a——

Mr. NITTLE. Did you then operate a mimeograph machine?

Mrs. FREED. I stand on my previous statement.

Mr. NITTLE. You stand on your privilege.

Now, I will pose the question: Have you recently operated a mimeograph machine?

Mrs. FREED. No.

Mr. DOYLE. May I see that exhibit, please?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Mrs. Freed, I hand you a copy of a leaflet marked for identification as Freed Exhibit No. 3, which is entitled "WESTCHESTER WOMEN FOR PEACE INVITE YOU TO A DISCUSSION OF CUBA."

"Time: Wednesday, December 12, 8:30 P.M. Place: Scarsdale Friends Meeting House, Popham Rd., Scarsdale, N.Y., off Rt. 22. Admission: Free."

Did you participate in the preparation or duplication of that item for dissemination?

Mrs. FREED. I did not.

(Document marked "Freed Exhibit No. 3" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the arrangements made for the affair to be held at the place noted, and for the discussion to be held on the subject of Cuba?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I didn't participate in the actual arrangements of this meeting, but at a meeting we did have a general discussion about having such a meeting.

Mr. NITTLE. You did participate in the discussions relating to this subject, did you not?

Mrs. FREED. General discussion, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you also discuss this problem with Mrs. Blanche Posner of the New York headquarters of Women Strike for Peace, your parent organization?

Mrs. FREED. Shall I read this again?

Mr. NITTLE. You may say "the same reply," if you wish.

Mrs. FREED. I question—the same reply as previously indicated.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Freed, I hand you a photostatic copy of the Independent Nominating Petition—Communist Party for the 1941 election, marked for identification as Freed Exhibit No. 4, upon which it appears that an Iris Schwartz of 659 Pennsylvania Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., signed that petition in support of the candidacy of well-known Communist functionaries, particularly named as Israel Amter, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and James W. Ford, who sought respectively the offices of Mayor, Comptroller, and President of the Council of the City of New York.

Are you the Iris Schwartz who executed that petition on September 15, 1941?

Mrs. FREED. I stand on the statement I previously made.

(Document marked "Freed Exhibit No. 4" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Is that not your actual signature appearing on that petition?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. The statement as previously stated.

Mr. DOYLE. May I inquire at that point, would you repeat the name of I. Amter?

Mr. NITTLE. Israel, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Israel Amter?

Mr. NITTLE. I-s-r-a-e-l A-m-t-e-r.

Mr. DOYLE. I see in Freed Exhibit No. 2, this Communist newspaper, the *Sunday Worker*, August 17, 1941, a picture which appears to me to be a picture of the young lady witness at that time.

Mrs. FREED. Thank you. That is some time ago.

Mr. DOYLE. I also see a letter dated August 18, 1941, which appears to be on Communist Party, USA, stationery and directed "to every member of the Communist Party of New York." In the right-hand column, it appears to be signed by I. Amter, chairman, Charles Krumbein, secretary. Apparently it is the same person—I. Amter being Israel Amter, chairman of the Communist Party in New York City—as shown on Freed Exhibit No. 4, which the witness has viewed, and I return Exhibit 2.

Mr. NITTLE. The petition is titled "Independent Nominating Petition—Communist Party," and it appears thereon that the signer pledges support of those persons nominated as candidates and selects the name "Communist Party" as the name of the independent body making the nomination.

Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you executed that petition?

Mrs. FREED. I stand on my previous statement, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer the question, Witness.

Mrs. FREED. I stand on the previous statement, sir.

Mr. BRUCE. You are invoking the privileges of the fifth amendment, is that correct?

Mrs. FREED. Yes, that is correct. Among others, sir. Would you like me to read them?

Mr. BRUCE. No, I think I know them.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the information of this committee that you had been a member of the Communist Party Carpet Shop Branch of Yonkers, N.Y., and that meetings of this branch of the Communist Party were held in your home in 1954.

We wish to give you the opportunity to affirm or deny this information or to establish its accuracy.

Mrs. FREED. I stand on the statement previously stated, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you, in fact, a member of the Communist Party during the year 1954?

Mrs. FREED. I stand on the statement previously stated.

Mr. NITTLE. The committee's investigation also reveals that you attended a Westchester County convention of the Communist Party in January 1957 and that you were an official delegate to that convention. Were you?

Mrs. FREED. I stand on the statement previously stated.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FREED. I stand on the statement previously stated.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer that question, Witness.

Mrs. FREED. I stand on the statement previously stated, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Questions, Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. No.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, Witness, you mentioned you had not been here yesterday at the hearings. Is that correct? Or were you here?

Mrs. FREED. I was, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And you heard me read that the subject of this inquiry is the extent of Communist infiltration into peace organizations. You heard that read yesterday; and, of course, therefore under our claim, these questions that we have been asking you are pertinent to this investigation.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I really don't understand it, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I won't argue with you at this time.

Thank you very much.

The subcommittee will stand in recess 5 minutes.

(Five-minute recess taken.)

Mr. DOYLE. Please be seated. The subcommittee will come to order.

Let the record show that a quorum of the subcommittee is present: Mr. Bruce, of Indiana, and Doyle, of California.

Are you ready, Counsel, to call your next witness?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Would Anna Mackenzie please come forward?

Mr. DOYLE. Will you please rise and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Please be seated.

TESTIMONY OF ANNA MACKENZIE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mrs. MACKENZIE. May I read this card?

Mr. DOYLE. No. Please wait until you are asked a question.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. It is from all the children.

Mr. DOYLE. Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence, please?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Anna Mackenzie, 36 Minuteman Hill, Westport, Conn.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you please give us the correct spelling of your last name? For as I understand, it has been variously spelled as M-a-c-k-e-n-s-i-c, M-a-c-k-e-n-z-i-e, and M-c-K-e-n-s-i-e.

would you tell us which is the correct spelling of your last name?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. The correct spelling is M-a-c (small) k-e-n-z-i-e.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself for the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Mackenzie, have you at any time resided at 327 Lexington Avenue, New York City?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I have.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you please state the date and place of your birth?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. February 17, 1914, Brookline, Mass.

Mr. NITTLE. Was your maiden name Anna DeCormis, D-e-C-o-r-m-i-s?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you please relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. A B.A. from Vassar.

Mr. NITTLE. B.A. from Vassar College?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your occupation?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Housewife.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a member of an organization known as Women Strike for Peace and, if so, would you tell us when you became a member of that organization?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Women Strike for Peace, as you must by now know, is not an organization. I am not a member. I am proud to have participated in some of the work of the movement.

Mr. NITTLE. As a matter of fact, it is our information that the degree of your participation was to the extent of having been appointed as a Connecticut State delegate to the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace. Do you hold such an office in that group?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. No, I don't.

(At this point Mr. Tuck entered the hearing room.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you previously hold such an office in that group?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. There are no offices, in the first place, and I am not being flippant about this. There are no offices. And I have not held office, because there are no officers.

Mr. NITTLE. This appears to be a most elusive organization and, therefore, I am compelled to submit for your inspection a document previously received in evidence, marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 1.

(Document handed to witness.)

Mr. NITTLE. It is titled "Structure for Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan N.Y., New Jersey, Conn." I will assume that you are familiar with this organizational plan?

Mr. BRUCE. Are you familiar with this plan?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I know it exists. I have never read it.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the adoption of that organizational plan?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I don't know that it was adopted.

If you would like to know how we operate in Connecticut, I would be able to tell you. We are there because we believe in our right to petition our Government for peace. We believe that in disarmament—

Mr. NITTLE. I did not ask you that, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Structure is something that I know nothing about, and it is not well organized.

Mr. NITTLE. I beg your pardon. I asked you whether you participated in the adoption of that organizational plan. And perhaps

you can state the degree of your participation. Was the plan discussed at meetings of the Central Coordinating Committee?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I don't know that the Central Coordinating Committee did anything.

The Central Coordinating Committee is something that you have given great stature to and made it sound almost as important as a congressional committee.

In Connecticut, we don't take it very seriously. Perhaps we should, but we don't.

Mr. NITTLE. Well, Mrs. Mackenzie, maybe you can tell us whether an organization known as Women Strike for Peace has any existence. Does it?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. There is a group of women who have called themselves Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Including Mrs. Blanche Posner, Mrs. Hoffman—

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Who is—

Mr. NITTLE.—other witnesses you have heard, and, of course, yourself?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I have told you that I have participated proudly in some of the actions of the Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Now it appears, Mrs. Mackenzie, that one of your activities in that organization, and perhaps the most conspicuous propaganda effort of Women Strike for Peace, was the sending of delegates from this organization to the disarmament conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in April 1962.

The committee's investigation discloses that you were in charge of publicity for the sendoff of Women Strike for Peace to Geneva. Did you have such a publicity function?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I was proud to have some small part in that delegation to Geneva in support of our Government and the other people who were working there for peace and general disarmament, which we all believe in, but I had no such responsibility at the time of the sending.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you three items which are marked for identification as Mackenzie Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. NITTLE. The three exhibits bear the imprint of Women Strike for Peace.

The first item, you will note, is addressed "TO ALL OUR KEY WOMEN" and is a plan of action relating to the Geneva expedition.

The second item is a petition, addressed "to the 17-Nation Disarmament Conference on behalf of WOMEN and CHILDREN EVERYWHERE."

The third item is a flier dated March 16, 1962, entitled "GENEVA, HERE WE COME!!!"

Did you participate in the preparation or dissemination of any of these items, or all of them?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Sir, I question the constitutional authority of this committee to ask me whether I prepared written material. I think I have a right to prepare petitions, to sign petitions, whether they be nominating petitions or petitions for general and universal disarmament.

(Documents marked "Mackenzie Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, and 3," respectively. Exhibits Nos. 1 and 3 appear on pp. 2141, 2142 and 2143, 2144, respectively. Exhibit No. 2 retained in committee files.)

Mackenzie Exhibit No. 1

Women Strike for Peace
TO ALL OUR FREE WOMEN

A Plea for Survival

MARCH 6... PRESIDENT KENNEDY announces decision to resume testing in interest of national security unless progress toward test ban treaty is made at Geneva.

MARCH 7... PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV replies ... if the U.S. starts testing, the Soviet Union will undoubtedly have to reply to this by holding a series of new tests....

The arms race accelerates ... More poison is spread in the atmosphere ... WE ARE THE LOSERS!

What can we do?

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE has captured the imagination of American women ...

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE has seized the attention of the national and world press because

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE has shown that American women will not take this mass murder quietly.

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE has shown that WE CARE ENOUGH TO ACT.

N.Y. POST, January 17, 1962...editorially responding to our dramatic pilgrimage to Washington:

"The women have demonstrated their unwillingness to surrender themselves to events...

Their example may encourage statesmen to make the extra effort when all appears lost."

THIS MONTH THE BIG DECISIONS ARE BEING MADE AT GENEVA.

OUR FATE IS BEING DECIDED BY THE 17 NATION DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE.

THEY MUST HEAR FROM US!

Projected Plan of Action

PETITION TO DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE ON BEHALF OF THOUSANDS OF AMERICAN WOMEN

PEACE PLANE CARRYING DAGMAR WILSON, RUTH GAGE-COLBY, FRANCES HERRING AND WOMEN FROM ALL OVER THE COUNTRY TO PLEAD FOR TEST BAN TREATY AND PROGRESS TOWARD DISARMAMENT.

On Sunday evening, April 1 at 10:45 P.M. a group of well briefed, articulate spokesmen for WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE from communities in the United States will embark on a peace plane for Geneva carrying with them a petition for survival signed by thousands of American women.

The flight will culminate three weeks of intensive work by all women associated with WEP to collect signatures, distribute information on the desperate need for disarmament, to raise necessary transportation money.

In Geneva, our women will meet with representative groups from Japan, England and as many other nations as possible to present a united plea for survival.

THERE WILL BE A SEND-OFF DEMONSTRATION AT IDLEWILD AIRPORT....

Farther information on time, place, speakers, will be forthcoming.

THIS MUST BE OUR BIGGEST EFFORT TO DATE. WE MUST SHOW THAT WE REPRESENT THE WILL OF MANY, MANY THOUSANDS.

Mackenzie Exhibit No. 1 (contd.)

Page 2

Women Strike for Peace

IMMEDIATE STEPS

Call a meeting of your local group immediately! Work out your plan of action for the greatest participation of your community. Suggested guide:

1. Reprint petitions and disarmament sheet at once. You are the best judge of quantities needed.
(New York City area: Pick up petitions and disarmament sheets at the office, 750 3rd Avenue, on Tuesday, March 13th.)

Distribute these to your women at once.

2. SIGNATURE COLLECTIONS...door to door, at shopping centers, at organization meetings in community, at social gatherings and ASK YOUR CONGRESSMAN to sign.
3. Contact clergy ...visit all local churches asking for a sermon giving blessings to Geneva and asking cooperation with our petition campaign. (One local group held a luncheon for 18 ministers at which they were addressed by a speaker we provided)...and in Brooklyn there will be a prayer day for Geneva.
4. Financial responsibility...We need money for our national spokesmen, money for printing and mailing costs to cover this action. Send to New York office, 750 3rd Avenue, New York City, New York, or to Washington office and earmark, GENEVA.....Local communities are encouraged to raise funds to send their own representatives. Round trip fare is \$350 if 25 women go. Stay will be 5 days. For reservations and for specific details contact Eilyn Polshek, 42 West 9th Street, New York 11, N.Y. GR 3-3892.
5. Alert New York area women to Idlewild send off, Sunday, April 1st, at 5 P.M. Let's give our Peace Plane delegates a send-off the whole world will hear!

Simultaneous send-offs from California etc., and in every city planning to send delegates should be arranged.

PUBLICITY AND EDUCATIONAL GOALS

PUBLICITY

News coverage can be Local, i.e., on petitions, on local person going to Geneva...National news in plane departure and congressional reaction to our petition....International news as the eyes of the world will be on the U.S. and U.S.S.R. meeting and the action of American women who oppose testing and urge imaginative action for disarmament is NEWS.

EDUCATION

The Disarmament sheet and the Petition will present our point of view on Geneva. We will distribute thousands and talk to many thousands of people in order to collect signatures. This means approaching new people, not talking to our own circles.
The returning delegates can be invited to speak at local meetings.

THIS ACTION WILL BE AS EFFECTIVE AS THE EFFORT WE PUT INTO IT.
LET'S GET TO WORK.

MacKenzie Exhibit No. 3

PLEASE READ FULLY AND IMMEDIATELY--THANK YOUWomen Strike for Peace
1822 Massachusetts Ave., NW
DC 6 Phone: 232-0803

March 16, 1962

GENEVA HERE WE COME!!!

PREAMBLE -- Plans are now being completed for the WSP plane to Geneva. Twenty-five women or more, from all over the U.S. (3 from DC) are leaving N.Y. Sunday, April 1, at 5:40 P.M.

Purpose of the trip is to dramatize to the delegates at the Disarmament Conference and to all the world the intense concern of American women for the survival of the world and the belief in the necessity for reaching agreements NOW. It has been said so often and yet it becomes more true each day--this may be our last chance.

While in Geneva our women will meet with women from other countries and together they will watch the proceedings and report their reactions to the world.

When they go to Geneva they want to take with them thousands of the enclosed petition, signed by women from all over our country. So please support our Geneva-bound women by getting it full of signatures and sending it in promptly. If you can use more, call us at the office or at OL 4-7226.

The various forms of news media are very much interested in this Geneva trip. They recognize it is unique and are following it with great interest. They will be at the airport to see the send-off given the travelers by their stay-at-home sisters, as well as following their activities at Geneva. In New York at the airport many of the New York WSP-ers will be there to see them off. WE WANT TO HELP WITH THE SEND-OFF TOO!!

*****SO NOW PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING*****

We are planning a chartered bus from Washington to N.Y., leaving Saturday, March 31, about 8:00 A.M. from some shopping center in the Silver Spring area, and arriving in New York shortly after noon. Our time in NY will be relatively unscheduled from then until Sunday afternoon, so you will be free to shop, go to shows, take sightseeing tours, or whatever. Sunday afternoon we will meet again at our bus and go to Idlewild airport to participate in a rousing send-off for the Geneva-bound women. Then home to Washington, arriving somewhere between ten and midnight.

The costs will be approximately \$10 per person for the bus and \$3.00 for overnight accommodations at the YWCA (dormitory rooms). These may vary slightly, depending on the number of people we have going. The rest of your expenses depend on what you feel like spending. Eleanor Garst says the YWCA serves very good food quite inexpensively. She had a fine big breakfast there recently for 50¢.

By the time we leave for this trip we will have information on what plays may be seen on such short notice. We'll be there in time for Sat. matinee, as well as Saturday evening.

(Over)

Mackenzie Exhibit No. 3 (contd.)

-2-

NOW HEAR THIS--

If you want to join the fun in New York (and maybe bring a husband along) you MUST SIGN UP BY WEDNESDAY EVENING AT THE LATEST--March 21. Call the office, 232-0802, or OL 4-7226, or EM 2-2771.

UMBRELLAS--All our women, and especially those going to New York, are urged to order a WSP umbrella--black or white--with "peace is our shelter" in white or black letters. \$3.50. Get those orders in by Wed., too.

WHO IS FAMILIAR WITH NEW YORK? We need a volunteer to help with some of the preliminary plans for this trip, whether she can go herself or not.

LAST BUT BY NO MEANS LEAST

It costs a great deal to make plans, telephone calls over the country, have petitions printed, etc., for this Geneva trip. Please open your checkbooks and send money to Women Strike for Peace, and earmark it "Geneva." Thank you so much.

Mr. DOYLE. I might state here, Mrs. Mackenzie, we do not question your right. Now just a minute. I just want to repeat it. We do not question the right to do that.

Were you here yesterday when I read the preliminary statement?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Yes, I was, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Showing the purpose of this hearing and investigation.

We have no controversy with your right to do it, to petition the Government and to sign petitions. We are interested in the one feature of this hearing, the extent to which the Communist Party or known Communists are infiltrating the peace movement. We know that some of them have. We know that some of them who have infiltrated are not very far from this hearing this morning. And so I want you to understand that I am sure the committee does not disagree with your statement, that you have a right to petition your Government, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I think the committee is trying to make it very hard for me to maintain my right.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, not at all.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. And I think that this is an attempt to prevent me and other people from exercising our rights to speak as women for peace to protect our children.

Mr. DOYLE. You have that right, and we recognize it and we are sure we have the right to ask your cooperation, to have your cooperation, in helping us to ascertain whether or not there should be any further legislation in the field of our Internal Security Act of 1950.

That is why we are here, whether we can suggest any further amendment to that existing law. It has nothing to do with the right of petition, we assure you.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Then why, may I ask, sir, is it brought up here? I am confronted with a petition and asked if I signed it, if I helped to prepare it.

I think that this is an infringement on my privacy and on my rights as an American citizen to speak out as I see fit. This is constitutionally, I thought--

Mr. DOYLE. Well, it certainly is. We are asking you that question manifestly. It may well be. Of course, we cannot reveal at this time to you all we know about perhaps some of the folks that signed that petition with you, but we are trying to ascertain whether or not known Commies have helped prepare that or joined with it or been responsible for it in any way, and if you have had no connection with the Communist movement, why, that is wonderful.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Sir, may I ask? I am not clear about one thing. Mr. Nittle, I believe, has yesterday mentioned the word "commendation" in connection with the action of one of the women.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that we proceed in the regular order.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the last question asked by counsel be repeated? I do not believe the answer was directed to the question.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Bruce, as I recollect, the question addressed to this witness was, "Did you participate in the preparation or dissemination of any of these items?"

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Sir, I decline to answer the question on the grounds that I do not think the question is pertinent and I question the constitutional authority of the committee to ask me questions concerning material that I have written.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I request that you direct the witness to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer the question, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand on my previous statement.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the witness has invoked a constitutional privilege at this point. She has merely questioned, in her judgment, the authority of this committee. I do not believe that is sufficient grounds.

The witness should be advised of her position.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, she has worthy and legal counsel by her side. I assume that—

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Would you clarify your point, sir?

Mr. BRUCE. Let me ask you directly: Are you invoking the privileges of the fifth amendment of the Constitution in answer to this question?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I am invoking the privileges of the first amendment and all relevant—all other parts of the Constitution which are applicable in the situation.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. Do you include, and do you mean to say, that you are invoking the fifth amendment privileges, particularly the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment, in refusing to respond to the question?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I am particularly not invoking the self-incrimination clause. I am standing on my rights as an American citizen, sir.

Mr. BRUCE. Let's just clarify that for a moment.

A moment ago you said you invoked the first amendment and all other constitutional privileges that pertain thereto, or words to that effect; now you say you are particularly not invoking the fifth amendment. Is that an amendment to your prior answer?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand corrected.

Mr. BRUCE. In what way?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand corrected, that excluded from my previous statement is——

Mr. BRUCE. I see. Then you are not invoking the fifth amendment?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. That is what I said.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I want, if I may, sir, just to make it perfectly clear. I am not invoking the self-incrimination clause.

Mr. NITTLE. Now you heard the chairman's opening statement at the commencement of the hearings?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I did. And it made me feel that he had already made up his mind about this problem; yes, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I said, you heard his opening statement?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I did, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Then you are aware that the purpose of this proceeding is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, with particular reference to Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I am sorry. Would you repeat the question? I didn't hear the first part.

Mr. NITTLE. I say, you are aware that the subject of inquiry of these hearings is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, particularly with reference to Women Strike for Peace and a New York group of that organization?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Well, you say so. I assume it is.

Mr. NITTLE. Now we are not investigating your beliefs, but your activities so far as they relate to that subject matter.

The committee, the Congress, and the American people are entitled to know what is the extent of Communist activities in the peace movement and what Communists are doing in concealing their activities in such movements.

Is that clear to you?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I have heard it.

Mr. NITTLE. With that explanation, Mr. Chairman, I think that the witness should be again directed to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I again instruct the witness to answer the question. And if there is any question about it again, Mrs. Mackenzie, I instruct you to answer the question.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I have lost track of the question by this time.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. May the question be read, please?

Mr. NITTLE. Before I repeat the question that the committee has directed this witness to answer, I think I should also state to the witness that the committee, Mrs. Mackenzie, is in possession of information that you have been a member of the Communist Party and that, more particularly, you were a member of the Communist Party in the year 1943 and that in 1944 you became a member of the Communist Political Association, a successor in title of the Communist Party of the United States.

In view of that information and the nature of this committee's inquiry, I think the pertinency and relevancy of the questions should be apparent to you and, also, that there is a reasonable basis for making this inquiry of you.

With that further explanation, I again respectfully request the chairman to direct you to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, I make that direction, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I am sorry. I am not being able to follow this. I don't know what the question is. I have heard many statements and allegations, but I don't know what the question is.

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel, will you repeat the question, or if you do not remember the exact substance of the question, ask the reporter to read it back?

Mr. NITTLE. The question, Mr. Chairman, is whether the witness, Mrs. Mackenzie, participated in the preparation or dissemination of any of the items, namely, Mackenzie Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, and 3, which are lying before her.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, with that question repeated, Mrs. Mackenzie, I direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds that the question is not pertinent.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. And I question the constitutional authority of the committee to ask me or to order me to answer it. I also seriously question whether this is an investigation or a punishment.

I think that the committee has made up its mind about the Women Strike for Peace. Mr. Doyle has made a long statement, attempting to disparage it. He made statements on TV that I heard last night that seemed to indicate that he, at least, has no questions about this, and I question the relevance or the pertinence of any of these questions on this ground. I think that there is no investigation here. There is simply a—

Mr. DOYLE. Have you stated now your answer? In other words, I think we have given you time enough to make your remarks, far in excess of the reason for your refusing to answer the question. We want to give you plenty of time to do it.

Are you claiming any constitutional grounds other than those stated?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Not other than those already stated.

Mr. DOYLE. Aren't you pleading either the first or the fifth amendment?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I did plead that, sir. I thought that was clear.

Mr. NITTLE. You excluded, however, from the fifth amendment the self-incrimination clause. Is that right?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I did, and I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Very well.

Mr. NITTLE. You are aware in refusing to respond, after a direction by the chairman to do so, that you may thereby subject yourself to a possible contempt prosecution or citation by the committee because of your failure to answer?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I understand that.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, did you participate in the preparation or dissemination of Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, and 3, which you have before you, in response to Communist directives to engage in such activities in Women Strike for Peace?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Would you repeat the question?

Mr. NITTLE. I will ask the reporter to repeat the question to you.

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I have operated—operated is the wrong word—I have acted in Women Strike for Peace, as elsewhere, I hope, according to the dictates of my conscience and only according to those dictates.

Mr. NITTLE. You refuse to respond to the question and you do not plead the fifth amendment privilege of the Constitution, particularly the self-incrimination clause thereof?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. That is correct.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you, Mrs. Mackenzie, a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I decline to answer the question on the basis that I have already stated. This is an infringement of my privacy as an American citizen. I am here because I have spoken for peace. That is the only reason I am here.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer the question, Mrs. Mackenzie, whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party of the United States.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand on my previous answer, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I beg your pardon?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer that question, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand on my previous answer, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer that question, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I stand on my previous answer, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, Mrs. Mackenzie, I direct your attention to the third exhibit which is addressed as emanating from "1822 Massachusetts Ave., NW, DC 6." This same address appears upon other literature as the address of a group titled, "Women's International Strike for Peace."

Are Women Strike for Peace and Women's International Strike for Peace one and the same organization?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Women in many countries are working for peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you please answer the question? I think it admits of a "yes" or "no" answer.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Well, this is possible. I don't know whether it does.

Mr. NITTLE. You don't know the answer to that question?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. NITTLE. Is that what you mean to say?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. You were using words that are not applicable. Using "organization," which is inapplicable. I don't know. There is nothing on these pieces of paper, as far as I see, that has anything to do with——

Mr. NITTLE. No, the name "Women's International Strike for Peace" does not appear upon the three exhibits I have shown you.

What does appear upon the third exhibit is the title "Women Strike for Peace."

However, it appears that an announcement has been made from the Washington headquarters of Women Strike for Peace that its new title is "Women's International Strike for Peace."

In view of the fact that the evidence indicates both these organizations bear the same address, 1822 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C., the committee desires to be informed as to whether or not the different titles are one and the same organization in fact.

We believe that you are in a position to inform us and may have knowledge of that fact. Do you?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I don't know the answer to this.

Mr. NITTLE. All right. Did you coordinate the publicity efforts with respect to the Geneva trip of Women Strike for Peace with the Washington office at 1822 Massachusetts Avenue?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. You use such big words. "Coordinate" is something that I don't think—

Mr. NITTLE. Well, did you maintain contact with the Washington office with respect to your publicity efforts emanating from the New York office of Women Strike for Peace?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. My efforts in connection with publicity for the Geneva delegation were very limited. I don't actually remember the details of how it was worked out.

Mr. NITTLE. You stated that you have attended Vassar College. Would you tell us the years during which you were in attendance there?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I graduated in 1937. I was there for the previous 4 years.

Mr. NITTLE. During the course of your attendance at Vassar College, were you not the editor of a student publication designated as *Miscellany News*?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I decline to answer that question. It is irrelevant. That was back in the 1930's. It is irrelevant because—I have a right to become an editor or a writer of any publication I see fit.

Mr. NITTLE. We do not question that at all.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. In privacy.

Mr. NITTLE. The American Student Union, Mrs. Mackenzie, was a Communist front which was created to win masses of student youth to Communist Party objectives. The investigations of this committee and other governmental organizations revealed that to have been the objective of the American Student Union. Chapters of this organization were set up on the campuses of numerous colleges and universities, including Vassar College.

Were you a member of the American Student Union while you were in attendance at Vassar College?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Students in the thirties were interested in peace. Many students are interested in peace now.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you please answer the question, Mrs. Mackenzie? It is a very simple question, and I think you understand it. It admits of a "yes" or "no" answer. Were you a member of the American Student Union during your attendance at Vassar College?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I decline to answer on the same ground that I

declined to answer other questions. I had a right to join the American Student Union, if I did.

Mr. NITTLE. You did not invoke the fifth amendment privilege—the self-incrimination clause—of the Constitution in refusing to respond to that question?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Are you suggesting it is criminal to have joined the American Student Union, or to have worked for peace?

Mr. NITTLE. I am asking whether or not you are invoking the fifth amendment clause—self-incrimination privilege—in your refusal to respond to that question.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. No, I am not.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you a member of the Young Communist League during your attendance at Vassar College?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I refuse to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer that question, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I decline to answer it on the ground stated.

Mr. NITTLE. You are not invoking the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment. Is that correct?

Mrs. MACKENZIE. That is correct.

Mr. NITTLE. I should make a further explanation, Mrs. Mackenzie, that the question is related, of course, to that of present Communist Party membership.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I beg your pardon?

Mr. NITTLE. The question is related to the question of any present Communist Party membership on your part.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. It seems to me that that is an unbecoming thing to happen in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. NITTLE. There is a principle in the law that a condition once shown to exist is presumed to continue.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. No condition has been shown to exist.

Mr. NITTLE. And in view of the subject matter of this inquiry today, we are also seeking information to determine whether or not you are engaged in activities in Women Strike for Peace in response to Communist directives.

It is, therefore, relevant to determine whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party, and with that explanation, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the witness be directed to answer the question of whether or not she was, while in attendance at Vassar College, a member of the Young Communist League.

Mr. DOYLE. I thought I had instructed you, Mrs. Mackenzie, but if I have not, I do instruct you to answer that question.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I decline to answer. These are not questions. These are stones that are being thrown at me.

Mr. NITTLE. The official organ of the American Student Union was titled *Student Advocate*. In the *Student Advocate* of December 1936, there appeared an item reportedly written by Anna DeCormis, editor, *Vassar Miscellany News*.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you make any contribution to the *Student Advocate*, the official organ of the American Student Union?

Mr. TAYLOR. The witness would like a minute's recess.

Mr. NITTLE. I have no further questions after her response to the last, and we would respectfully request an answer to it.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. Would you repeat the question, please?

Mr. DOYLE. Are you ready, Counsel?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Did you, under the name Anna DeCormis and as editor of the *Vassar Miscellany News*, contribute an article or articles to a magazine entitled *Student Advocate*, which was the official organ of the American Student Union?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

I had a right to write for whatever publication I chose, if I did write.

Mr. DOYLE. What, Mr. Nittle, was the Student Union?

Mr. NITTLE. The American Student Union was a Communist front organized some years ago, and one of its activities was to participate at that time in the peace movements then initiated and emphasized during the Stalin period.

Investigations have established that the American Student Union was one of the organizations established by the Communist Party to conduct peace agitation and continued to exist during the period of the Hitler-Stalin Pact.

Mr. DOYLE. And it was about those organizations that you made inquiry?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Further, Mr. Doyle, as I previously stated to the witness, the American Student Union was created by the Communist Party to win the masses of student youth generally to the objectives of the Communist Party. It was extremely active immediately preceding World War II and particularly active in engaging in peace agitation, seeking to prevent the participation of the United States in the war against Nazi Germany at a time when the Hitler-Stalin Pact was in existence, from 1939 to 1941.

Mrs. MACKENZIE. I left college in 1937. I don't see the relevancy of any of this, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Any other questions, Mr. Nittle?

Mr. NITTLE. No, sir. The staff interrogation is concluded.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Mrs. Mackenzie.

Call your next witness, Mr. Nittle, please.

Mr. NITTLE. Would Elizabeth Moos please come forward?

Mr. DOYLE. Witness, will you please raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss Moos. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF ELIZABETH MOOS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
TELFORD TAYLOR**

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence, please?

Miss Moos. Elizabeth Moos, 552 Riverside Drive, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel, Miss Moos?

Miss Moos. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. DOYLE. May I inquire, were you in the hearing room yesterday, Miss Moos, to hear this preliminary statement?

Miss Moos. I was in the hearing room. I regret very much that that statement, however, was not repeated for the benefit of those people who didn't hear it, because I believe that they may not have a clear picture of what the committee is trying to do.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, your distinguished counsel was here and heard the statement read, and you heard it read, and that is why I wanted to make sure that you had.

Miss Moos. I was here, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your marital status?

I merely am inquiring whether you are presently single or married, that is all.

Miss Moos. I am presently single.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Miss Moos. I was born on February 12—a good day, Lincoln—1890, in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Miss Moos. I graduated from Smith College in 1911, with the usual A.B. degree. I then went to Wellesley and took an advance education course in education and physical education. After some years, I went to Columbia and took graduate courses in anthropology. In 1947–48, I entered Columbia University, where I received my M.A. in Slavic literature, and also the certificate of the Institute for Russian Studies. Oh, and in addition, 3 years ago when I decided I wished to go back and get a little more firsthand information about present school education in this country, because that is my field, I took courses at Bank Street College in order to equip myself to work, and did so.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Miss Moos. I am retired.

Mr. NITTLE. You have not, however, completely abandoned all activity; have you?

Miss Moos. At a time of history like this, I don't see how anyone can sit in a rocking chair and knit. This is the time when we all ought to be active.

Mr. NITTLE. As a matter of fact, you have been active, have you not, in an organization known as the Metropolitan branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom?

Miss Moos. I have worked with them in what way I could in a very minor capacity. I have never been an officer, I have never had any position which had anything to do with planning, policymaking. I have stuffed envelopes and I have gone to meetings. I have done all the minor little jobs that one can do.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, you have participated in meetings of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and you have been active in discussion groups, or discussions conducted at such meetings; have you not?

Miss Moos. I have not. I have been present, and if you mean by participation, have I attended, and naturally spoken up when there are discussions going on; yes, I have.

Mr. NITTLE. You indicated that in this period you could not remain inactive. There was a past period some years ago when you were likewise active in matters similar to that in which you are now engaged.

Were you not formerly the director of the Peace Information Center?

Miss Moos. I was. The executive secretary was the correct title.

This organization, it should be said, is one which existed, let me see, 12 years ago, for a brief period, and does not exist.

Mr. NITTLE. All right. Now we will talk a little more about it. It is the committee's information that the Peace Information Center assumed as its principal task the circulation of the World Peace Appeal, also known as the Stockholm Peace Appeal. This appeal was issued in March 1950 by a Communist-controlled organization known as the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress, which met in Stockholm, Sweden.

It is our information that you attended the World Peace Congress held in Paris in April 1949 and that you subsequently made a report of your attendance there to a convention of the Communist-controlled Congress of American Women at its convention in May 1949.

Were you in attendance at the World Peace Congress held in Paris in April 1949?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. Yes, I am very proud to say that I was in Paris at the convention in 1949. Obviously, I—I must make a statement. My statement of the fact that I attended this in no way agrees with your characterization of it, however.

Mr. NITTLE. Well, we shall see.

Miss Moos, the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress met in March 1950 to launch the World Peace Appeal. You are aware of the fact that it did meet in March 1950 to launch that World Peace Appeal, are you not?

Miss Moos. I read it in the papers.

Mr. NITTLE. At the time.

Miss Moos. After it.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, you will recollect that the meeting of the World Peace Congress—the Permanent Committee thereof—was just 3 months before the Communist invasion of South Korea.

Did you, Miss Moos, pursuant to instructions or advice received from persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party, participate in the organization of the Peace Information Center on or about May 1950 for the purpose of circulating the World Peace Appeal in the United States?

Miss Moos. I did not. Now, the answer to this question should probably be qualified. When you ask three or four questions—what is known as a loaded question—I think I have a right to ask you to divide them up. If you ask whether I sat in at a meeting at which

the possible desirability of setting up something to be known as a Peace Information Center was discussed, the answer is yes.

What you have stated as its purpose was not true.

At that time, the Peace Information Center was discussed because many people felt that activities were going on all over our country and the world and that somebody ought to let it be known, let one peace group know what another was doing.

That was its sole purpose when it was set up.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you engage in the activities of the Peace Information Center in response to your understanding of Communist directives at that time to engage in such activity?

Miss Moos. Certainly not.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a letter marked for identification as Moos Exhibit No. 1, which is dated May 17, 1950. It bears the letterhead Peace Information Center.

Miss Moos. Where is "Exhibit 1"? This says "Exhibit 2."

Mr. NITTLE. That should be identified as "1," actually. I have it previously marked with a "2."

You have corrected that, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. The officers of the organization are designated on the letter and your name, "Elizabeth Moos," appears as the director.

Now, your name appears thereon as the director of the Peace Information Center.

Miss Moos. You are correct. I had thought I was called executive director. I was not.

(Document marked "Moos Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. The letter states, does it not, that a Peace Information Center has been set up in New York City and that its purpose is to bring news of "peace activities" here and throughout the world. The letter bears what appears to be the signature of Elizabeth Moos, director, and that is your signature on that letter; is it not?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. Yes, that is my signature.

Mr. NITTLE. Your organization also issued booklets titled *Peacegram*.

Miss Moos. They were not booklets, they were just what it said, *Peacegram*, which was a brief announcement of what was going on.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of one such issue, which is marked for identification as Moos Exhibit No. 2.

You will note the claim therein that after 6 weeks of signature gathering, about 1½ million Americans had signed the World Peace Appeal and that this figure helped to swell the world total of some 250 million, a number which you claimed equaled one-tenth of the earth's population. The *Peacegram* also indicates that more than one-half of the U.S. signatures were gathered after the Communist invasion of South Korea.

Now, from what source did you obtain the information about the total number of signers of that Appeal?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. I am sorry. I must say that I have never seen this before. I was not with the organization at the time that this was issued, so I am afraid I can't give you any information about it. I served with them for a very brief period.

(Document marked "Moos Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. What was the period of your service?

Miss Moos. I think you have the date at which a group met to discuss the desirability. I have forgotten what that was. That spring, I resigned. I was not well.

Mr. NITTLE. You organized it, and then got out of it?

Miss Moos. I did not organize it. I was asked whether I would help on it, and I did, for a brief period. I did not ever see this document.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you asked to become the director of it by any person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Miss Moos. No.

Mr. NITTLE. At that time, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois was chairman of the Peace Information Center. He has recently admitted his Communist Party membership, and I think the matter was published some months ago in the *New York Times*.

Did you then know Dr. DuBois to be a member of the Communist Party?

Miss Moos. Dr. DuBois was not a member of the Communist Party at that time. If you will look at your papers, you will find that there was a great deal of excitement here and abroad when about 6 months ago, Dr. DuBois announced that, at the age of 93 or 94, he had finally decided that he wished to become a member of the Communist Party. He had never been a member of the Communist Party before that.

Mr. NITTLE. Several years before, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People expelled Dr. DuBois from membership or official position in the NAACP because of Communist activities. Did they not do so in the forties?

Miss Moos. I can't answer that question.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, also growing out of the World Peace Congress, which met in Paris in April 1949 and which you state you attended, was the establishment in this hemisphere of a gathering titled "American Continental Congress for Peace."

That group, Mr. Chairman, is described in the committee's *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications* as "aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

I hand you a copy of the *Call to the American Continental Congress for Peace* marked for identification as Moos Exhibit No. 3.

That *Call*, you will observe, has for its purpose the establishment of an organizational meeting to take place at Mexico City, September 5-10, 1949.

I direct your attention to the Women's Sponsoring Committee from the United States, and you will see—

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is that? We can't find it.

Now we have it.

Mr. NITTLE. I direct your attention to the Women's Sponsoring Committee from the United States, and you will observe that the name, "Elizabeth Moos," appears thereon.

Are you the Elizabeth Moos whose name appears upon that *Call*?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. I question the constitutional authority of this committee to require me to answer this question.

I also question its pertinency to any matter you are authorized to inquire into in this year, 1962.

I, therefore, invoke my right under the Constitution, in that I can't be required to be a witness against myself, and decline to answer.

(Document marked "Moos Exhibit No. 3" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Now, I noted, Miss Moos, that you raised the question as to the authority of the committee and the pertinency of the question, and you then said "I, therefore, invoke," what I take to be the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment.

It is my understanding—and I believe your own counsel will advise you—that you cannot invoke the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment because you believe that the committee has no authority or because you believe the question is not pertinent; you may invoke it only because you believe that an answer to the question may subject you to a criminal prosecution. Therefore, I must ask whether you assert the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment for the reason that you believe an answer to the question will possibly subject you to a criminal prosecution?

Miss Moos. I invoke my rights under the fifth amendment of the Constitution that no person shall be forced to bear witness against himself and, therefore, I decline to answer.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. I am invoking the fifth amendment. I am invoking all of the provisions which are pertinent.

Mr. NITTLE. Miss Moos, the American Russian Institute of San Francisco, with offices at 101 Post Street, was cited in September 1948 by Attorney General Clark as a Communist organization in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board.

It appears that in the year 1943, at a time when you may have recovered from your illness, the American Russian Institute published a booklet titled *We Pledge Peace*, a Friendship Book.

The Friendship Book contained an item at page 53 entitled "The World Will Rejoice," under the byline of Elizabeth Moos, who is described as an educator and founder of the Hessian Hills School.

A copy of this article, which I hand you, is marked Moos Exhibit No. 4. Were you author of that article?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. May I ask counsel to repeat the date which you gave, which I am quite sure was erroneous.

Mr. NITTLE. The article appears to have been published in the year 1953.

Miss. Moos. You said 1943 before.

Mr. NITTLE. If I did, I wish to correct it. It was an inadvertence.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. I stand on my prior claim.

(Document marked "Moos Exhibit No. 4" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Miss Moos, did you participate in any of the demonstrations conducted by the New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Miss Moos. I am sure I must have. Whenever I saw a crowd of women with signs saying, "We don't want any more poison in our babies' milk," I would drop whatever I was doing and go and walk

with them, and I am sure that quite often it must have been some of the Women Strike for Peace, because they have done a lot of it.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes; there are all kinds of poison in this world, and for that reason, I must ask you a question which will follow.

In an appearance before the U.S. Senate Investigations Subcommittee, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on Friday, July 30, 1948, William W. Remington identified you as his mother-in-law and as a Communist. He testified that you once held a position as a director of the Hessian Hills School in Croton and that you were forced out of that position when your Communist affiliations were revealed.

He indicated that a person named Alvin Warren, who had fought in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain, came to live at your home and completed your conversion to communism, a conversion in which Joseph North, the editor of the Communist *New Masses*, now a contributor to *The Worker*, participated, and who had been brought to your home by Alvin Warren about the year 1940.

Was there any inaccuracy in the testimony of William W. Remington which I have summarized?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss Moos. I stand on my prior claim.

Mr. NITTLE. Herbert A. Philbrick, an undercover operative for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who appeared before this committee on July 6, 1953, testified that on one occasion, before the Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, commonly known as the "Red" Dean, came to this country, instructions were received from Communist Party headquarters to prepare for the arrival of the Red Dean and to give him a welcome in Boston.

Herbert Philbrick testified that he was assigned to work with you and that he did so at your apartment on Walnut Street in Boston.

Do you wish to offer any correction or explanation of Mr. Philbrick's testimony?

Miss Moos. Once again I invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment and decline to answer your question.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, Miss Moos?

Miss Moos. I repeat, under the fifth amendment, I invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment and decline to answer your question.

Mr. NITTLE. Is your present participation in the peace movement a response to Communist directives to engage in such?

Miss Moos. Before answering that, I think I must make a statement that I think this committee is doing a terrible disservice to America and to everyone in the world—

Mr. NITTLE. Now, will you please answer that question?

Miss Moos. I will be heard—when they try to attribute every act, every conscious act that is done for peace to the Communists. Are they the only ones? Do you think they want peace more than we do?

Having made this statement, I decline to answer your question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions. Thank you, Miss Moos.

The public hearings will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., Wednesday, December 12, 1962, the public hearings were recessed until 10 a.m., Thursday, December 13, 1962.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1962

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session at 2:15 p.m., in Room 219, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Subcommittee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle, of California; William M. Tuck, of Virginia; and Donald C. Bruce, of Indiana.

Staff members present: Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Raymond T. Collins, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. Mrs. Gross, will you please raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. GROSS. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Be seated by your counsel there, please.

TESTIMONY OF CEIL GROSS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mrs. GROSS. My name is Mrs. Ceil—that is C-e-i-l—Gross, G-r-o-s-s. I live at 145 West 96th Street, New York 25, N.Y., Apartment 10A.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself for the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you spell your first name, Mrs. Gross?

Mrs. GROSS. C-e-i-l.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you also been known as Celia Gross?

Mrs. GROSS. No; that is, it is frequently misspelled. That is why I spelled it, but that is not my name. My name is Ceil, C-e-i-l.

Mr. NITTLE. But your name on occasion has been spelled Celia Gross by others?

Mrs. GROSS. My name has been misspelled many times, both the first and the last name. Officially my name is C-e-i-l, and since my name has been C-e-i-l, that is how I have always spelled it.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you in the year 1945 reside at 545 Powell Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.?

Mrs. GROSS. I never lived in Brooklyn, N.Y.

¹ Released by the committee and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRUCE. Counsel, may I interrupt here?

I would like to pursue your statement here that since your name has been C-e-i-l, that is how you spelled it. Was there another name?

Mrs. GROSS. I don't think it is pertinent to the hearing. If you gentlemen want to hear I will tell you. My mother named me Cecile, C-e-c-i-l-e. I never saw my birth certificate until I was about 20. I discovered on my birth certificate I am listed as Ceil, C-e-i-l. I do not know how the difference occurred. I have no idea.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you for the clarification.

Mrs. GROSS. When I discovered this I then took this as my name because that is how it is spelled legally. It is not what my mother wanted me to be named.

Mr. BRUCE. Thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. GROSS. I am a high school graduate.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. GROSS. I am a production assistant.

Mr. NITTLE. What is the nature of your employment and by whom are you employed?

Mrs. GROSS. I am employed in the printing industry.

Mr. NITTLE. Who is your employer?

Mrs. GROSS. I do not think that is pertinent to the hearing here. I question your right to ask me that question.

Mr. NITTLE. It is for the purpose of identification.

Mrs. GROSS. You have identified me fully and completely.

Mr. NITTLE. What is the basis for your refusal to respond to that inquiry?

Mrs. GROSS. I stated my basis.

Mr. NITTLE. Is your employer the Advance Publishing Co.?

Mrs. GROSS. I question your right to ask me that question. I do not believe it is pertinent to the hearing here, and I stand on my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. In the interrogation of a prior witness in public session, Miss Rose Clinton, we had occasion to relate the origin of an organization titled "Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups," and a supporting group titled "West Side Peace Committee." I hand you a copy of a large advertisement marked for identification as Gross Exhibit No. 1, which appeared in the *New York Times*, August 29, 1961, at page C18, titled "West German Rearmament—with nuclear weapons—is the Main Issue in Berlin."

This is designated on that advertisement as a public statement by the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups. You will note that your name appears thereon as secretary of that organization. You are, are you not, the Ceil Gross whose name appears thereon as the secretary of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as previous.

Mr. NITTLE. What is that answer?

Mrs. GROSS. That I do not believe you have a right to ask me that question. I do not think the question is pertinent to the hearing, and I stand on my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Which amendment?

Mrs. GROSS. The fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. When you invoke the fifth amendment as a basis for your refusal to respond to that question, are you referring to the self-incrimination clause of that amendment?

Mrs. GROSS. I am referring to the entire amendment, and in particular that clause which allows me not to testify against myself.

(Document marked "Gross Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Would you tell the committee when you were appointed to that position and how your appointment to that position was effected?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. The advertisement, Exhibit No. 1, is obviously a very expensive item to publish in the *New York Times*. From what source were funds derived to meet this expense?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

(At this point Mr. Tuck left the hearing room.)

Mr. NITTLE. By whom was this advertisement prepared?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Did anyone known to you to be a member of the Communist Party participate in the preparation of that advertisement?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you another large advertisement which appeared in the *New York Times* on May 10, 1961, at page C31, marked for identification as Gross Exhibit No. 2. The advertisement is titled "Rally for Peace To Stop the Spread of Nuclear Weapons" and announces the appearance of Dr. Linus Pauling as a speaker at Carnegie Hall, New York City, for May 12, 1961. As indicated thereon, the advertisement is sponsored by the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups, "100 Days for Peace," 550 Fifth Ave., New York 36, N.Y.

Were you the secretary of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups at the time of the appearance of this advertisement on May 10, 1961?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

(Document marked "Gross Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. By whom was this advertisement prepared?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Did any person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party participate in the preparation of that advertisement?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. The advertisement carries the names of numerous persons who are designated as sponsors of the meeting to be held at Carnegie Hall on May 12, 1961. By whom were these sponsors selected?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. The address of 550 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, N.Y., which is given as the address of the organization, is actually not an office of the group, but simply a mailing and telephone service located at that address; is it not?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Does your group still subscribe to that mailing and telephone service?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. I specifically point out to you in Exhibit No. 2 that the sponsoring group is noted as the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups, "100 Days for Peace." What is the significance of that addition of "100 Days for Peace" following the title of your organization?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that following the Senate investigation of Communist infiltration of the nuclear test ban movement, which closed in October 1960, Henry Abrams formed an organization called the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups in November 1960 and that he assumed the position of chairman of the conference. It appears that this organization was established by Henry Abrams for the purpose of providing a vehicle for peace agitation by persons expelled from chapters of SANE in its efforts to eliminate Communists from its ranks. Immediately after it was formed, the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups—beginning on January 21, 1961—staged "100 Days for Peace" agitation of various kinds in New York City under the sponsorship of a 100 Days for Peace Committee—for which Henry Abrams, by the way, served as spokesman.

Is this a correct explanation of the use of the phrase "100 Days for Peace" in Exhibit No. 2.

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you not also been selected as the cochairman of the West Side Peace Committee?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. The committee's investigation reveals that you were in fact selected as the cochairman of the West Side Peace Committee. Therefore I ask, Are you presently serving in that capacity?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that the West Side Peace Committee was formed on or about February 1961, following the expulsion of Henry Abrams from SANE in January 1961. Was not the West Side Peace Committee formed on or about February 1961?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Committee investigation discloses that the West Side Peace Committee was established as a neighborhood group or action committee in support of the coordinating organization known as the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups. The function of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups appears to be to involve other organizations in the so-called peace movement and to coordinate their activity on special projects.

Was not the West Side Peace Committee established as a neighborhood group in support of the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that you, Ceil Gross, were appointed as a cochairman of the newly formed West Side Peace Committee and that you have been active in it since its inception.

Is that not a correct statement of fact?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Our investigation further discloses that your residence at 145 West 96th Street, Apartment 10A, New York City, telephone RI 9-0506, has been designated as the official address of the West Side Peace Committee.

Is that a correct statement?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Our information further reveals that Rose Clinton assumed the position of secretary and membership chairman of the West Side Peace Committee at the time you received your appointment as a cochairman of that organization. Do you know Rose Clinton?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know her to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know Henry Abrams?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer that question, madam, whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you specifically, Are you pleading any part of the U.S. Constitution in that answer?

Mrs. GROSS. Yes. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you plead the fifth amendment before?

Mrs. GROSS. Yes, I did, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And you are doing it now?

Mrs. GROSS. Yes, I am.

Mr. DOYLE. If you answered that question truthfully, are you fearful that it might subject you to criminal prosecution?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. All right, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. You have participated in the activities of Women Strike for Peace, have you not?

Mrs. GROSS. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. My answer is the same as before.

Mr. DOYLE. You say your answer is the same as before?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no further questions, Counsel. Call your next witness.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Jean Brancato.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Please be seated.

TESTIMONY OF JEAN BRANCATO, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and address for the record, please?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Jean Brancato, 712 East Gun Hill Road, Bronx, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes, I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. How do you spell your first name, Mrs. Brancato?

Mrs. BRANCATO. J-e-a-n. I have also spelled it with an "e."

Mr. NITTLE. You have also spelled your first name as J-e-a-n-n-e?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you formerly reside at 235 East 120th Street, New York City?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes, I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Mrs. BRANCATO. February 6, 1923, Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you Mrs. Erasmus L. Brancato?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. You are married?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the date of your marriage?

Mrs. BRANCATO. December 20, 1947.

Mr. NITTLE. Was your husband also known by the name of Ed Brancato?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your education, giving the dates and places of the schools attended?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I graduated from Omaha Technical High School in 1940 and a year at New Haven State Teachers College, 1940 and 1941.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Housewife, occasional typing, part time.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you been employed as a teacher at any time in the past?

Mrs. BRANCATO. No, never.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that you have been Bronx representative on the Central Coordinating Committee of an organization known as Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

Would you tell the committee whether you hold such an office?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. BRANCATO. Would you repeat the question, please?

Mr. NITTLE. I indicated that it was the committee's information that you are a Bronx representative on the Central Coordinating Committee of an organization known as Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Will you tell the committee whether you now hold such an office and whether you have held such an office?

Mrs. BRANCATO. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you been active in a group known as Women Strike for Peace of Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. BRANCATO. I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer. I don't understand its pertinence and I invoke my constitutional privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you repeat the witness' answer, please? I did not hear it.

(Answer was read by reporter.)

Mr. DOYLE. I think in view of that answer I should ask, Were you in the hearing room yesterday morning when I read the preliminary statement?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You heard it read?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all.

Mr. NITTLE. When you invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment as basis for your refusal to respond to that question, are you invoking the self-incrimination clause of that amendment?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you sincerely believe that a reply to the question posed to you might involve you in a criminal prosecution?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of a document previously marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 1, which is titled "Structure for Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan N.Y. New Jersey Conn."

Did you participate in the preparation or adoption of that plan of structure?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. As a member of the Central Coordinating Committee do you have access to the official records, minutes, and proceedings of this organization?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have any formal or written rules of procedure been adopted by that organization to implement or to supplement the structural plan established in Posner Exhibit No. 1?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. It appears in Posner Exhibit No. 1 that the local group provides the basic representation in the county group, on the Central Coordinating Committee, and on the General Assembly. However, the structural plan defines a local group as consisting of "any body of women who have meetings and act in concert for the general purpose of peace."

Of what local group are you a member?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Are there any rules established by the organizational plan, Posner Exhibit No. 1, or any implementing bylaws, rules, or regulations, to define the acceptable composition and number of a local group that would authorize representation of it on a county group or on the Central Coordinating Committee?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Under the plan set up in Posner Exhibit No. 1 is it not possible for a well-organized minority to pack the county group, the Central Coordinating Committee, and the General Assembly?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you ever resided at 740 East Gun Hill Road, Bronx, N.Y.?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes, I have.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you in 1949 circulate and witness a nominating petition of Benjamin J. Davis, Communist Party candidate for councilman of the city of New York?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you Brancato Exhibit No. 1, a photostatic copy of that petition titled "Communist Party Independent Nominating Petition," addressed to the Board of Elections in the city of New York, N.Y., upon which appears the statement that the undersigned persons declare they are duly qualified voters intending to support, at the ensuing election, the person so nominated, and select the name of the Communist Party as the name of the independent body making the nomination.

The signature and affidavit of "Jeanne Brancato" appears on that petition certifying that she, "Jeanne Brancato," knows each of the voters who subscribe to the petition and that each of them subscribed to the petition in her presence.

Is that your signature appearing thereon as the witness to that petition?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

(Document marked "Brancato Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Are you a member of the Communist Party, Mrs. Brancato?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer that question or specifically state what constitutional privileges you stand on, if any.

Mrs. BRANCATO. I invoke my constitutional privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. And you are invoking the self-incrimination clause of that amendment?

Mrs. BRANCATO. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. At the time you executed this petition, Brancato Exhibit 2,¹ did you not know Elizabeth Gurley Flynn as a member of the Communist Party and a leading Communist functionary who was at that time convicted under the Smith Act?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

(Document marked "Brancato Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel, may I inquire whether you asked the witness about present Communist Party membership? Was that the question, or was it whether or not she was a member of the Communist Party when she signed this petition?

¹ Independent Nominating Petition, Peoples Rights Party, naming Elizabeth G. Flynn as candidate for Representative in Congress, 24th Congressional District, Bronx County, New York, dated September 1, 1954.

Mr. NITTLE. As I recollect the question, Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to inquire whether she is now a member of the Communist Party. If you desire I shall re-pose that question to her.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is as I understood the question. Have you asked her yet whether or not at the time she signed this petition she was a member of the Communist Party? If she signed it, I assume she read it.

Mr. NITTLE. My recollection, Mr. Chairman, is that that question was not posed, but to clarify the point may I ask those two questions of the witness?

Mr. DOYLE. I wish you would and make it clear.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you in the year 1954 a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I invoke my constitutional privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. Do you know the meaning of the term "united front"?

Mrs. BRANCATO. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. BRUCE. No further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no further questions. Thank you.

I would like to have the record show that at all times since the beginning of this hearing, in executive session this afternoon, there has been either a full subcommittee present, three of us, or two of the three present. I mention that because at this time Mr. Tuck is not present, but Mr. Bruce and Mr. Doyle are.

Thank you, Counsel. Call your next witness.

(At this point Mr. Bruce left the hearing room.)

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Miriam Chesman.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you please rise and be sworn?

Mr. TAYLOR. Are you lacking a quorum now?

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. We will wait until the other member returns, please. I neglected to notice he was out.

(At this point Mr. Bruce returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. Let the committee come to order. Let the record show that Messrs. Bruce and Doyle, two of the three officially appointed members of the subcommittee, are present. Therefore, a quorum is present. Therefore, we will proceed and ask the witness to be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you please be seated by your counsel.

TESTIMONY OF MIRIAM CHESMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, TELFORD TAYLOR

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and address for the record, please?

Mrs. CHESMAN. My name is Miriam Chesman. The address is 985 Waring Avenue, the Bronx, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself for the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. Telford Taylor, 400 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Chesman, have you ever resided at 1117 White Plains Road, Bronx, N.Y., and if so for what period?

Mrs. CHESMAN. Frankly it would be hard for me to remember the number. It was some place on White Plains Road.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the period of your residence on White Plains Road?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I know it was a period during which my husband was in the Army so it would be some place in the early forties or the middle forties or something like that.

Mr. NITTLE. You are Mrs. Leon Chesman, are you not?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I was born in New York City on April 2, 1915.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am a graduate of Hunter College, year of '35.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am a housewife, mother of two children.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information, Mrs. Chesman, that you are a Bronx delegate to the Central Coordinating Committee of the organization, Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

Are you a Bronx representative?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am not, and I want to clarify that. You know, you must be very bored by now with the question of structure and—

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Chesman, I think you will have an opportunity to develop subjects of interest upon pertinent inquiries as we go along.

Mrs. CHESMAN. Then I simply want to say I am not because—

Mr. NITTLE. Have you ever been a Bronx delegate to the Central Coordinating Committee of that organization?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I have never been an official delegate because there are no such things.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you a delegate, whether official or otherwise, to the Central Coordinating Committee?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I have attended them sporadically when there was nobody else that could go.

Mr. NITTLE. When did you first attend a meeting of the Central Coordinating Committee?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am sorry, but I don't remember.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the organization of the Central Coordinating Committee of that group?

Mrs. CHESMAN. No, I don't think so.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you tell us when you first attended meetings of the Central Coordinating Committee?

Mrs. CHESMAN. You know, this date business is very difficult. I don't want to be difficult, but I really do not remember when I first attended that meeting because, as I say, it is not a clearly defined area at all.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of a document previously marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 1, which is titled "Structure for Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan N.Y. New Jersey and Conn."

Did you participate in the preparation or adoption of that structural plan?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I did not.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in any discussions relating to it?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I did not because—you see, this is where I have to explain. I happen not to be interested in structure and, as a matter of fact, I said to a friend of mine yesterday that I avoided all this because it is just not my interest, and that for the first time I was hearing a real discussion on structure.

Mr. NITTLE. You will note that that plan sets up an organization involving an hierarchy of a local group, county group, Central Coordinating Committee, and the General Assembly. It also establishes a New York office and work committees.

When you attended discussions with the Central Coordinating Committee was there a General Assembly established for the organization Women Strike for Peace and set up under that organizational plan?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I have no such recollection.

Mr. NITTLE. Will you tell us of what local group you are a member?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am a member of an East Bronx group and I am not—look, I want to make it clear.

Mr. NITTLE. What is the title of that group?

Mrs. CHESMAN. The same thing the other women said is what I would like to repeat. I am not a member. I didn't mean to indicate, because you know there is no membership. I am a participant in Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Well, you compose one of that group, Women Strike for Peace, do you not?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I do.

Mr. NITTLE. I believe the technical definition of membership is to that effect—one who composes a group.

We won't quibble about words, and therefore I will proceed to ask you what is the full title of your East Bronx group?

Mrs. CHESMAN. It doesn't really have an official title. It is just an East Bronx group, because the lines of the groups aren't that clearly defined.

Mr. NITTLE. A Jean Brancato also serves on the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut; does she not?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I would like not to discuss anything in relation to any other personality but myself.

Mr. NITTLE. We aren't discussing personalities. We are discussing activities.

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am sorry, I don't see where a discussion of whom I know has any pertinence to this inquiry.

Mr. NITTLE. We are not simply interested in whether or not you know a Jean Brancato. We are interested in knowing whether you know a Jean Brancato as being active as a representative on the Central Coordinating Committee of Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. CHESMAN. I would prefer not to discuss any personalities in relation to anything at all.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I request that the witness be directed to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer the question, Witness.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CHESMAN. I question the authority of this committee to require me to answer. I don't understand its pertinency to this inquiry and I invoke at this time my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Were you present yesterday, Mrs. Chesman, when I read the preliminary statement?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I was present.

Mr. DOYLE. You heard the statement read?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I did.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well to pursue the point just for a moment.

I think we better make it clear that your sentiment regarding your feelings as to the jurisdiction of this committee, or its function, is in no way connected with your pleading the privilege of the fifth amendment. You are pleading the privilege of the fifth amendment on the basis of not being required to incriminate yourself. Am I correct?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I would rather restate that. I am taking the fifth amendment because the fifth amendment protects the innocent against testifying against themselves, and of course I am protesting the authority of this committee on those grounds, to answer the question.

Mr. BRUCE. This is not why you are not answering the question. It is, rather, the incrimination clause of the fifth amendment?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I would say both.

Mr. DOYLE. I think I heard you say to protect the innocent. As I understand that amendment, it protects anybody from testifying against oneself.

I am not making that observation except that I noticed you used the word "innocent" there.

Mrs. CHESMAN. This is my primary concern.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Do you think that if the relevancy and pertinency of this question was explained to you again, in addition to the reading of the preliminary statement yesterday, you then would answer the question?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CHESMAN. Upon considering your question I still feel that I would like to stand on my protection under the fifth amendment as I previously stated.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in the organization of the East Bronx group to which you referred?

Mrs. CHESMAN. In a vague kind of way. You know, I think one of the difficulties here is that it is hard for men to understand that women can work in a very vague and nebulous way, and I think I am sympathetic to you in that.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes. Mrs. Chesman, I hand you a copy of the *National Guardian*, issue of October 8, 1962, marked for identification as Chesman Exhibit No. 1, and direct your attention to a lead article which appears on page 6 entitled "Pressure on the Candidates—Women of Peace movement turning to political action." I quote from the article so that you will follow as I read it. Then I will ask you a question pertaining to this.

"In and around New York on Oct. 3, several hundred women were to assemble at shopping centers and on busy street corners"—

Mr. TAYLOR. We have lost you.

Mrs. CHESMAN. Where are you? There is no underlining particularly and it is difficult to——

Mr. NITTLE. The item appears in the initial paragraphs.

In and around New York on Oct. 3, several hundred women were to assemble at shopping centers and on busy street corners with petitions designed to "make the candidates speak out on the peace issue." The day was designated for an all-out effort to obtain signatures on the nation-wide petition initiated by Women Strike for Peace. The goal is one million signatures.

The petition pledges signers to vote for candidates who will support measures to 1) bring an end to nuclear testing and spread of weapons; 2) achieve general and complete disarmament under UN safeguards and develop a national program to facilitate conversion to a peacetime economy; and 3) strengthen the UN and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Was this action of Women Strike for Peace initiated or directed by the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. CHESMAN. Honestly, I do not know.

(Document marked "Chesman Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in any discussions which led to the adoption of that particular action?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I may have, but I would be dishonest if I answered you absolutely.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Chesman, the official record indicates that a Miriam Chesman in 1946, resident at 117 White Plains Road, Bronx, N.Y., was a signer of a Communist Party nominating petition for several persons, including Robert Thompson who was listed as a candidate for the office of Governor of New York upon the Communist Party ticket.

I hand you a photostatic copy of that petition marked for identification as Chesman Exhibit No. 2. Are you the Miriam Chesman whose signature is upon that nominating petition?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CHESMAN. I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer. I do not understand its pertinency to this hearing and I again must invoke my constitutional rights under the fifth amendment that states that I do not have to testify against myself.

(Document marked "Chesman Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. You will note that the petition is titled "Communist Party Independent Nominating Petition." It is directed to the Secretary of State of New York and states that the signers of that petition declare their support of the candidates nominated, and select the name "Communist Party" as the name of the independent body making the nomination.

Were you a member of the Communist Party at the date of execution of that petition.

Mrs. CHESMAN. I will have to repeat that I again invoke the fifth amendment which says that I do not have to testify against myself.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask what is there, and I am not asking this just to be argumentative, about signing a petition like this for the nomination of a man to public office, when the Communist Party is involved, which raises in your mind a possibility of criminal prosecu-

tion if you said you had signed it? What is there about the Communist Party which raises the fear in your mind of criminal prosecution?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am terribly sorry, but I will again have to invoke my protection under the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel and members of the committee, I have noticed that all these witnesses we have had yesterday and today, with the exception of Mrs. Meyers, manifestly signed those petitions that were submitted to them. They don't say they didn't sign them. None of the witnesses has denied signing them, as I recall, excepting Mrs. Meyers. Every other person to whom you have submitted a petition pleaded the constitutional amendment against self-incrimination.

Is there something about doing something for the Communist Party that makes them fearful of criminal prosecution if they admit it? What is there?

Mrs. CHESMAN. That is a question?

Mr. DOYLE. I am not trying to lead you to answer it, you understand.

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am sorry. I just wasn't clear as to whether you were just making a remark.

Mr. DOYLE. You have already answered it and invoked your constitutional protection, but there must be something in the Communist Party that makes you people who have endorsed it for public office afraid of something.

What is it? Is there some criminal conspiracy in the Communist Party that is known, on your part, as a criminal conspiracy, is it a violation of law, or what is it? Let me be frank with you because I didn't ask this question at this point just to be argumentative, but we know it is an international conspiracy, don't you see, the Communist outfit, in the United States.

This committee knows that. There is abundant evidence to the effect, and our Supreme Court has so held, that the Communist movement is an international conspiracy attempting to impose the Communist philosophy of government on the United States of America and any other free nation. I surmise that the people who have signed this petition, such as you signed, now know at least—whether you knew it then, you know it now—that it is a criminal conspiracy. And I don't see why some of you folks that signed those petitions, at this stage of the game when you know the history of the world as it is, don't come out forthrightly and help our own Nation to fight the conspiracy by helping your congressional committee, for instance.

I have talked frankly with you, but it just has kind of worried me to have so many of you women who are in this Strike for Peace, who have signed those petitions knowing you were signing a Communist document, now afraid of criminal prosecution if you face up to the fact.

I wish to repeat again, Mr. Taylor, I didn't raise this question at this point with your client expecting any discussion with her, but I want the record to show that I have noticed that fact. I am sure every member of the committee has. We just don't understand how women and citizens who claim to be patriotic Americans, and I am not inferring that you are not, madam—I want you to

understand that—but I do know that when you signed that petition you knew it was a Communist petition, because it says so, and for years you should have known that it is a dangerous conspiracy. This committee is trying to protect our Nation against it. I don't understand why you women in this movement who signed that sort of a petition will not help us understand it.

You have pleaded your privilege.

Mrs. CHESMAN. I think I want to make it clear that when you started discussing this petition I invoked my right under the fifth amendment not to discuss the question.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. You will note I didn't raise this discussion until after you had pleaded your constitutional rights and I am not trying to get you to waive them either. Let me make that clear.

Mrs. CHESMAN. I simply wanted to make the thing quite clear.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Chesman, in 1951 a nominating petition was circulated on behalf of a Communist Party functionary named Clifford T. McAvoy, who was seeking the office of President of the Council of the city of New York as the candidate of the American Labor Party. The official records indicate that a Miriam Chesman of 985 Waring Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., was a signer of his nominating petition. I hand you a photostatic copy of that petition marked for identification as Chesman Exhibit No. 3. Does your signature appear thereon as a signer of that petition?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer. I again must invoke my protection under the fifth amendment.

(Document marked "Chesman Exhibit No. 3" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you know Clifford T. McAvoy to be a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I will try not to be so wordy. I stand on the fifth.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I state for the record that the New York City section of the American Labor Party was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 23, 1956, as a subversive organization.

The latter committee reported as follows:

Communist dissimulation extends into the field of political parties forming political front organizations such as the * * * American Labor Party. The Communists are thus enabled to present their candidates for elective office under other than a straight Communist label.

Now, Mrs. Chesman, I would direct the question to you as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party in the year 1951 at the time of the execution of Clifford T. McAvoy's petition.

Mrs. CHESMAN. I stand on my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. The official records further indicate that a Miriam Chesman of 985 Waring Avenue, Bronx, N.Y., was, in September 1954, the signer of a nominating petition for Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who was then a candidate on the Peoples Rights Party, independent ticket, for Representative in Congress from the 24th Congressional District, Bronx, N.Y.

I hand you a photostatic copy of that petition marked for identification as Chesman Exhibit No. 4. Are you the Miriam Chesman who appears to have signed such a petition?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am sorry, but I must again invoke my rights under the fifth amendment.

(Document marked "Chesman Exhibit No. 4" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you then know Elizabeth Gurley Flynn to be a leading Communist Party functionary?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I must again invoke my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you a member of the Communist Party during the year 1954?

Mrs. CHESMAN. Fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Chesman, did you at any time serve as a subscription clerk or staff member for the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CHESMAN. I am sorry, but I must stand on my prior statement—that I must invoke the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should reflect—

Mrs. CHESMAN. Just a minute.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. CHESMAN. Well, I was just trying to save time. Of course I hope you understand that when I say fifth amendment I am repeating that I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer, that I do not think this question pertinent to the investigation, and therefore I invoke my constitutional right under the fifth amendment.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I challenge the use of the fifth amendment the way it was stated. She stated first of all her challenge of the jurisdiction of the committee and then followed it with "therefore." Do you mean that you are invoking the fifth amendment because you question the jurisdiction of the committee, or because of the self-incrimination clause?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I also invoke my constitutional rights. You know, I haven't much experience at this sort of thing and you will have to be patient with me.

Mr. BRUCE. We will.

Mr. DOYLE. Manifestly, Mr. Bruce is correct in his interpretation, in raising that statement to find out from you what you really were relying on.

Mrs. CHESMAN. On both.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should reflect that the Institute of Pacific Relations contained an international secretariat to accomplish its objectives.

An American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations was established together with other institutes in free societies, including Great Britain, France, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Philippine Islands, Pakistan, and other countries. The American Council was in existence as early as 1925. The American Council was thoroughly investigated by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary whose report of July 2, 1952, declared in part that the American Communist Party and Soviet officials considered that organization "an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence."

The Senate report discloses the activity of this institute on behalf of advancing Stalin's policy for Communist subjugation of China. The hearing record of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Part 14, at page 4989, reveals that a Miriam Chesman was listed as a staff member of the American Institute of Pacific Relations for the years 1944, 1945, 1946, and that she served in the position of subscription clerk.

MR. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I think we might also for the record point out that the hearings by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee reached the conclusion after very extensive hearings, and I believe these are almost the exact words, that the organization to which you referred constituted a conscious, articulate instrument of Soviet policy in the United States, and particularly dealing with the gentleman that they were conducting hearings on, who was Mr. Owen Lattimore.

MR. NITTLE. Mrs. Chesman, were you a member of the Communist Party during the years 1944, 1945, and 1946 while serving as a subscription clerk for the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

MRS. CHESMAN. I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer. I do not understand the pertinency of the question to this hearing and I also invoke my constitutional rights under the fifth amendment. Have I learned?

MR. BRUCE. I think so.

* * * * *

MR. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, Mrs. Chesman?

MRS. CHESMAN. I stand on my prior answer.

MR. NITTLE. Did you engage in activity on behalf of Women Strike for Peace in response to Communist directives?

MRS. CHESMAN. I stand on my prior answer.

MR. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE. Mr. Bruce.

MR. BRUCE. Mrs. Chesman, you and other witnesses, both this afternoon and this morning, have made quite a point out of the use of the term "organization." You stress that it is not an organization. You describe it then as just a spontaneous response of people from their own personal feelings. Yes or no?

Is that how you would describe it?

MRS. CHESMAN. Well, this is one thing I agree with, with all the other women in the Women Strike for Peace.

MR. BRUCE. Will you speak just a little louder?

MRS. CHESMAN. That it is just this kind of thing.

MR. BRUCE. I think most anyone who has had any experience with organization realizes that in order to have a response there must be some central direction.

Is the literature that is used and the fliers that are handed out sent to these "spontaneous" response groupings from any central place?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

MRS. CHESMAN. I can't answer these questions. You have gotten a complete description of this movement and it is quite obvious that—I mean there is nothing written down that anybody can give a definite answer on.

It's been pointed out that people participate when they want to and there is no organization involved at all.

MR. BRUCE. Is it not true, Mrs. Chesman, that the various groups in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut somehow find themselves passing out the same fliers and the same type of literature—identical, as a matter of fact?

MRS. CHESMAN. Well, I guess if there is enough to go around.

MR. BRUCE. How do they get hold of these things then if there is no central organization to it?

MRS. CHESMAN. I don't see the point of going into this really. I think we have discussed Women Strike so much that——

MR. BRUCE. The point I am making, madam, is that you yourself opened up——

MRS. CHESMAN. —that you should know by now the kind of thing it is.

MR. BRUCE. You opened up this line of inquiry, as did other witnesses, though, by your insistence that there is no organization. I am simply trying to find out if there is no organization how does the material get distributed among all of these groups?

MRS. CHESMAN. It may sound like a miracle to you, but it does.

MR. BRUCE. I know it does, but what I am trying to find out, since you apparently by your own statement have been active in the Women Strike for Peace, is where do you get your material?

MRS. CHESMAN. I guess somebody gives it to me.

MR. BRUCE. Who gave it to you?

MRS. CHESMAN. Ah, now. Shall I repeat my statement?

MR. BRUCE. If you choose.

MRS. CHESMAN. I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer. I do not understand the pertinency of this question, and I invoke my constitutional privileges under the fifth amendment. I stated before I will discuss no one but myself.

MR. BRUCE. Is it true, Mrs. Chesman, that by deliberate plan the Women Strike for Peace chose the avenue of no official open organization, but, rather, found it more expedient to operate without a tight organization?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

MRS. CHESMAN. I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer. I don't understand its pertinency. I invoke my constitutional privileges under the fifth amendment.

MR. BRUCE. Thank you very much.

MR. DOYLE. May I follow Mr. Bruce's question on that point by asking you this.

Manifestly from your answer, you have received printed material from the Women Strike for Peace. You frankly, by inference at least, have said you did, as far as I interpret your answer. Now, in effect, you say to us, "Well, I am not even going to tell you where I got it." That is what your answer means, so what is there about the Women Strike for Peace that you don't even want the U.S. Congress to know where the printed literature comes from which you have received? It must come from some office or some outfit, some place in some city.

That is all we want to know. Where does it come from? We are not asking you to tell us the name of any individual. Where do you get it from, up there in New York? Does it come through the mail? How do you get it? What are you afraid of? Criminal prosecution if

you tell us where the office is? Certainly it isn't a hidden office. They must pay rent if they have an office.

For instance, I was given this morning this press release. This has Women Strike for Peace, 1822 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington. The Washington office isn't afraid to give us a press release that was issued from their official office in Washington. Is there something crooked or illegal about the New York office?

Mrs. CHESMAN. Is that a question?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. What are you afraid of to tell us that?

Mrs. CHESMAN. Again on the ground previously stated I must invoke my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. You remember the subject of the inquiry of this hearing. I just want to read you one sentence to refresh your memory. This is what I read the other morning and which you said you heard:

The subject of this inquiry is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, particularly in the Metropolitan New York area and with special reference to Women Strike for Peace.

I can tell you frankly that I made up my mind that the Women Strike for Peace is being infiltrated by Communists very definitely. I am also saying that probably most of the women in Women Strike for Peace are not Communists and never would be. They are asleep with their eyes open or they are not concerned. They are putting in their enthusiasm for peace, which we men all join and back 10,000 percent, any patriotic action for peace, but I want to say again as far as I am concerned I have come to the conclusion very definitely that the Women Strike for Peace is being infiltrated by known Communists, and I think you know it.

Mr. BRUCE. Mrs. Chesman, have you ever received financial support from the Communist Party in order to promote Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. CHESMAN. I question the authority of the committee to require me to answer. I do not understand its pertinency and I invoke my constitutional privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Any other questions, Counsel?

Mr. NITTLE. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Witness and Counsel.

(Whereupon at 4:35 p.m., Wednesday, December 12, 1962, the executive session adjourned, subject to call.)

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

(Women Strike for Peace and Certain Other Groups)

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1962

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D.C.
PUBLIC HEARINGS

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m. in the Caucus Room, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Subcommittee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle, of California; William M. Tuck, of Virginia; and Donald C. Bruce, of Indiana.

Staff members present: Francis J. McNamara, staff director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Raymond T. Collins, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will please come to order.

Those who are going to be seated, please be seated.

On the first day of these hearings I read a preliminary statement from the committee announcing the pertinence of these hearings. Because, manifestly, there are many people in the hearing room now who were not here on the first day and possibly some witnesses are here now that were not here when this was read, I am going to read it again.

(For opening statement, including committee resolution and order appointing subcommittee, see pp. 2063-2067.)

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel, are you ready to call your first witness?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir. Would Dr. William Obrinsky please come forward?

Mr. ROSS. May it please the chairman, my name is Paul Ross and I am counsel for the witness. I respectfully request you to instruct the photographers not to photograph this witness while he is here.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. I make that instruction. Photographers will please cooperate.

Will you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Please be seated.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM OBRINSKY, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, PAUL L. ROSS

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Dr. OBRINSKY. My name is Dr. William Obrinsky. I reside at No. 1 Emerson Drive, Staten Island, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I am. My counsel is to my right.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel please identify himself for the record, stating his name and office address.

Mr. Ross. Paul L. Ross, R-o-s-s, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state whether or not you were formerly a resident of New Orleans, La.?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Sir, I respectfully decline to answer this question because I am a practicing physician, and to a physician the sacredness of human life is a direct and early and on-going experience, and it is no less sacred when millions of lives, not one, are at stake——

Mr. NITTLE. Just a minute——

Dr. OBRINSKY. —and I am invoking my rights under the first amendment and my privileges under the fifth.

Mr. DOYLE. Doctor, I instruct you to answer the question. This question is clearly pertinent and relevant. It is a matter of identification. The Supreme Court has ruled time and again that this committee is entitled to know the identification of any witness appearing before it.

Dr. OBRINSKY. May I consult with counsel?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, sir.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. I insist on the answer I have just given.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the date and place of your birth?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. May I ask how this is pertinent to this investigation of peace?

Mr. DOYLE. I will answer it. It is a matter of identification. It is clearly pertinent and clearly relevant.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer that question.

Dr. OBRINSKY. My same answer holds.

Mr. NITTLE. When you refer to the fifth amendment as a basis for your refusal to respond to the question, are you invoking the self-incrimination clause of that amendment?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. I invoke the fifth amendment in all its parts.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Dr. OBRINSKY. May I ask how this is pertinent, sir?

Mr. DOYLE. For the same reason that I gave you in your other two refusals to answer, a matter of identification.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. I respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. NITTLE. Dr. Obrinsky, did you in the early part of 1961 organize the Staten Island Community Peace Group?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Sir, I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you not in March of 1961 issue press releases on behalf of this group, the contents of which were published in the *Staten Island Advance*, a daily newspaper circulated in your area?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I decline, sir, to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. I now hand you two news items, marked for identification as Obrinsky Exhibit No. 1, which appeared, respectively, on March 6 and March 15, 1961, in the *Staten Island Advance*.

You will note that the former item reports that the Staten Island Community Peace Group met the previous evening in the Unitarian Church hall, New Brighton, and planned a theater party for April 12 in the Empire Theater at which the film "Grand Illusion," described in the newspaper account as an anti-war film, would be shown. It was also reported that your group announced circulation of a petition, allegedly drafted by Linus Pauling, protesting the spread of nuclear weapons.

The latter item repeats the announcement of the sponsoring by your group of a showing of an anti-war film titled "Grand Illusion" and carries the announcement that your "peace group" is also circulating a petition which will be presented at the Oslo meeting of the NATO powers April 15. That petition seeks to avert an expansion of the nuclear power to the member nations of NATO.

Did you prepare the press releases and make this information available to the press on behalf of the Staten Island Community Peace Group?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. Sir, I repeat that I invoke my rights under the first and my privilege under the fifth.

(Documents marked "Obrinsky Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Would you tell us please whether offices are maintained by the Staten Island Community Peace Group?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Where are these offices located?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I still decline to answer, sir, same answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Are the offices located or maintained in your residence or place of business?

Dr. OBRINSKY. The same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I assume that your group is still in existence. Is it?

Dr. OBRINSKY. The same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you tell the committee the number of persons who comprise its membership in addition to yourself?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I am afraid I must give you the same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Dr. Obrinsky, were you not formerly the chairman of the Staten Island Committee in the Greater New York area of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. During what period of time have you served as chairman of the Staten Island Committee of SANE?

Dr. OBRINSKY. The same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I assume that you are no longer chairman of that committee?

Dr. OBRINSKY. The same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Following the hearings of May and October 1960 of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee inquiry into Communist infiltration in the nuclear test ban movement, Henry Abrams, a leader in the Greater New York Committee of SANE, revealed as a Communist, was expelled from membership in that organization in January 1961. Did you continue to hold your position as chairman of the Staten Island Committee of SANE after January 1961?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Sir, I give you the same identical answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you not organize the Staten Island Community Peace Group following your termination of membership in SANE?

Dr. OBRINSKY. The same answer applies.

Mr. NITTLE. Dr. Obrinsky, on February 15, 1957, Dr. William Sorum, a doctor and psychiatrist in private practice, residing then at 2267 Carondelet Street, New Orleans, La., testified in hearings before this committee that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1945 until 1952 and that he was a member of the State Committee of the Communist Party of the State of Louisiana during the years 1946 and 1947.

Did you know Dr. William Sorum during the course of your residence in New Orleans, La.?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I reply the same answer, sir, to this question.

Mr. NITTLE. You were, were you not, a resident formerly of New Orleans, La.?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I give you the same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Dr. Sorum testified further that, in the course of his membership there, he was assigned to the Professional Branch of the Communist Party in New Orleans and that William Obrinsky was likewise a member of that branch. Are you not the William Obrinsky to whom Dr. Sorum referred in his testimony?

Dr. OBRINSKY. The same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you a member of the Professional Branch of the Communist Party in New Orleans, La.?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Once again the same answer.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I must give you the same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you not now a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I give you again the same answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer that question, Witness.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. NITTLE. Dr. Obrinsky, I hand you a copy of a news item, marked for identification as Obrinsky Exhibit No. 2, which appeared in the *Staten Island Advance* December 20, 1961, titled "Panel Splits on Fallout Shelters."

The item reports a debate which took place the previous evening in the Town Forum series, with you appearing as a speaker, pointing out the hazards of fallout or bomb shelters. Did you appear as a debater on the panel as reported?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I give you the same answer, sir.

(Document marked "Obrinsky Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. The account of the position you took in the debate indicates that you were strongly opposed to the creation of any shelter program. Is that correct?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I give you the same answer.

Mr. NITTLE. How did you secure for yourself a place on the panel of debaters?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Dr. OBRINSKY. I give you the same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. I assume that you do not hold yourself out as a specialist on civil defense, do you?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Same answer, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you engage in that activity for the purpose of carrying out Communist directives to infiltrate the peace movement?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I give you the same answer as previously, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you seek a position on the Town Forum upon specific instructions of any person known to you to be in a position of leadership in the Communist Party?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I give you the same answer.

Mr. NITTLE. I now hand you a copy of a document marked for identification as Obrinsky Exhibit No. 3. That particular document was issued by the National Education Department of the Communist Party, United States of America, dated March 1961, and titled "DISCUSSION OUTLINE on the STATEMENT OF THE 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS PARTIES and on THE UNITED STATES IN TODAY'S WORLD (Report by Gus Hall to the National Committee, CPUSA)."

Mr. DOYLE. May the record show that the witness and his counsel are inspecting the exhibit.

Mr. ROSS. First page, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NITTLE. In the statement and report referred to in that exhibit, Communists were directed to engage in peace agitation within non-Communist societies. Have you at any time personally received a copy of that document?

Dr. OBRINSKY. I decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

(Document marked "Obrinsky Exhibit No. 3" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. On the cover page of Exhibit 3 it is stated that:

This outline is designed for four classes or seminars. It may also be used in the preparation of group discussions or of lectures on specific points, or as an aid in reading or self-study.

Did you create the Staten Island Community Peace Group so that you may lead a group to participate in the activity suggested by this statement?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Same response, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you under the discipline of the Communist Party at the time you engaged in activities as chairman of the Staten Island Committee of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, as an organizer or member of the Staten Island Community Peace Group, and as a participant in the Town Forum discussions?

Dr. OBRINSKY. Same answer.

Mr. NITTLE. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Witness.

Are you ready, Counsel? Call your next witness.

Mr. NITTLE. Would John W. Darr, Jr., please come forward.

Mr. DOYLE. I just wish to simply say that enough applause is plenty, but there will be no toleration by the Chair of undue taking of time to applaud or interrupt the hearings. I expect the cooperation of every patriotic American in the room. That is the only time I will say this.

Mr. Darr, will you raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DARR. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Please be seated.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN W. DARR, JR., ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, LAWRENCE SPEISER

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Darr, you complied with rule IX of the committee, which requires that any witness desiring to read any statement to the committee shall submit that statement to the committee for its reading and information at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. This subcommittee received your proposed statement dated December 10. We have considered it, and I read our reply to you at this time:

The committee received and has given consideration to your communication in submitting a statement of your views regarding this hearing and the reasons for the position you propose to take when questioned.

The committee disagrees with your conclusion that the hearings are not justified and it does not accept as valid the grounds asserted by you for your anticipated refusal to answer questions. Upon conclusion of your testimony, the committee will determine whether any portion of it is relevant and shall make it the subject of investigation and whether it will be inserted in the official transcript of the proceedings.

Mr. DARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My difficulty is that this statement states my grounds for refusing to answer any questions at this hearing and, since I don't stand on the first or the fifth amendment, I really need a fuller statement of these grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course the committee doesn't recognize anything except legal constitutional grounds as reasons for refusing to answer questions.

Mr. DARR. I realize that, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Therefore we cannot permit you to take the time to read this lengthy document.

Mr. DARR. Would you be willing to recognize conscience?

Mr. DOYLE. I have answered your question. You give whatever answer you feel is justifiable or essential as far as your conscience or anything else is concerned, but we can't permit you to take time to read this prepared statement.

Mr. DARR. Thank you, sir. You may have noticed at the bottom of my statement I asked if you would be willing to include in the record of this hearing the record of my testimony before the Senate committee since it supplements the stand upon which I refuse to cooperate?

Mr. DOYLE. I have answered that the full committee will consider the full matter at the conclusion of these hearings.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mr. DARR. John W. Darr, Jr., 158 Waverly Place, New York 14, N.Y.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mr. DARR. Under the proper circumstances I would be happy to answer questions about myself and my work for peace, but I will not answer them—

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute. You are violating the rule of the Chair and you are out of order.

Mr. DARR. I am sorry, sir. I thought you said I could try and state my grounds, as best I could.

Mr. DOYLE. But not to read your statement.

Mr. DARR. I am not reading my statement. I am trying to put it all down in one sentence.

Mr. DOYLE. Make the sentence very short.

Mr. DARR. I will do the best I can, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we first identify Mr. Darr's counsel for the record. Mr. Darr, you are represented by counsel, are you not?

Mr. DARR. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel identify himself for the record, please?

Mr. SPEISER. I am Lawrence Speiser. I am an attorney. My offices are at the American Civil Liberties Union, 1101 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Speiser, are you appearing here on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, or are you appearing as the personal attorney of Mr. Darr?

Mr. SPEISER. Mr. Darr requested the American Civil Liberties Union to provide counsel for him. We in the past have had counsel appear for witnesses, representing them as their attorneys, where we feel there is a civil liberties and constitutional right involved. I am appearing here as Mr. Darr's attorney and I am representing him.

Mr. DARR. May I complete that statement, Mr. Congressman?

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state the constitutional provisions upon which you rely? An explanation will not be necessary.

Mr. DARR. I am sorry, I will not answer that question or any other question on the grounds, the one-sentence grounds, that I would like to read, sir. May I read them?

Mr. NITTLE. But do you rely on any of the constitutional provisions in your refusal to respond to the question posed to you?

Mr. DARR. I rely first and foremost on my conscience.

Mr. NITTLE. I asked you whether you relied on any constitutional provision now. It is a very simple question, Mr. Darr.

Mr. DARR. I think the rights of the Constitution are always available to me, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you rely upon any particular provision of the Constitution and, if so, will you state that provision, please?

Mr. DARR. Mr. Speiser?

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. DARR. I think you realize, as Mr. Speiser reminded me, that in my statement I say I do rely on the first amendment to the degree

that it is available to me, but if it were fully operated I wouldn't be subpoenaed for a hearing of this sort.

Mr. NITTLE. You invoke the provisions of the first amendment of the Constitution. Do you invoke the provisions of the fifth amendment of the Constitution?

Mr. DARR. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. NITTLE. And do you invoke specifically——

Mr. DARR. Except for the due process. I was reminded of this once before.

Mr. NITTLE. You invoke the due process clause of the fifth amendment, but——

Mr. DARR. Not the self-incrimination part.

Mr. NITTLE. In view of that response by the witness, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that he be directed to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer the question.

Mr. DARR. May I now say why I won't answer?

Mr. NITTLE. Just a moment. I think you stated your grounds, Mr. Darr, and, if in response to future questions you wish to rely upon those grounds, I think it will be sufficient for you to state, "I refuse to respond for the same reasons."

Mr. DARR. Then let me just, if I may, add one phrase, that I stand on the first amendment to that degree because the first amendment protects the——

Mr. NITTLE. We don't require any explanation of the first amendment. We have had other witnesses rely upon that as well, and I think the Congress fully understands the Constitution.

Mr. DARR. Mr. Chairman, could I read this one sentence?

Mr. DOYLE. No. The committee will accept the way our counsel has suggested as to your statement, that you refuse to answer that question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. DARR. So what you are saying is you are refusing to let me state my ground in full or even in a one-sentence statement.

Mr. DOYLE. You have stated your ground.

Mr. DARR. But I haven't, sir. Really, there are very profound reasons why I, in good conscience, refuse to cooperate with this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Then in good conscience cooperate with the extent of our suggestion, in order to save time and all, that you refuse to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. DARR. Ordinarily I would like to answer these questions, but I won't——

Mr. DOYLE. I am not going to permit you to read that long statement.

Mr. DARR. I understand that, sir. I am not intending.

Mr. DOYLE. Please cooperate in good conscience, which you rely upon, and obey the rules of the committee.

Mr. DARR. All right, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. That is a fair request. You know that.

Mr. DARR. I want to cooperate with the rules, but not with the procedure.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your present occupation?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer, although I would be glad to answer under other circumstances because of my conscience.

Mr. NITTLE. We suggest to you that, if you are refusing to answer for the same reasons, one would think that your conscience would require that you would respond in accordance with the rules of a congressional committee. We wish you would confine yourself to stating legal grounds for your refusal to testify.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. DARR. Mr. Chairman, I am reminded by my counsel that there seems to be no rule of the committee that requires me to say I give the same answer, that if you wish each time I can—I see you nodding your head, Mr. Bruce—that I can restate my ground each time. I don't want to take up the time of this committee, but at the same time I don't want to be put in the position of, I don't know, trying to hide behind something. I am trying to stand for something and to speak to you and the American people.

Mr. DOYLE. I will go this far with you. Make the one-sentence statement——

Mr. DARR. Then, from then on I will be willing to say I stand on——

Mr. DOYLE. That is a sentence, not a page.

Mr. DARR. No, it is a sentence.

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead.

Mr. DARR. All right. Thank you very much. Under the proper circumstances, I would be happy to answer questions about my work for peace; but I will not answer them here because, within the context of this hearing, to answer any questions would be to cooperate with a proceeding I must, in conscience and for the reasons given in my statement you received, oppose as harmful to the democratic processes and to the work for peace necessary for the survival of human values and life in the nuclear age.

Mr. DOYLE. That is period.

Mr. DARR. That is period.

Mr. DOYLE. I appreciate your applauding the ruling of the chairman.

Mr. DARR. And I appreciate your responding to my conscience, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Darr, among your occupations appears to be that of chairman of the board of directors of the Greenwich Village Peace Center, with offices at 133 West Third Street, New York City. Is that not correct?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer for the grounds given.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of a mimeographed letter——

Mr. DARR. I refuse to accept the copy of the mimeographed letter for the same reasons.

Mr. NITTLE. We will pass it to your counsel. It is marked for identification as Darr Exhibit No. 1. It is on the letterhead of the Greenwich Village Peace Center, and I direct your attention to the page thereof dated November 12, 1961, upon which appears your name as John Darr, chairman of the board of directors. You are the John Darr named thereon, are you not?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same ground.

(Document marked "Darr Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Upon what date did you assume the chairmanship of the board of directors?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I request that there be a specific direction to the witness to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you assume a position of leadership in the formation of the Greenwich Village Peace Center?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. I ask for a direction, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer, Witness.

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. By whom were you appointed to the position of chairman of the board?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you, Mr. Darr, participate in the selection of other members of the board of directors?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. Could you tell us the date when the Greenwich Village Peace Center was formed?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of a leaflet marked for identification as Darr Exhibit No. 2, titled "Greenwich Village Peace Center Newsletter" under date of October 1962. I direct your attention to page 2 thereof, where appears an item titled "FIRST ANNIVERSARY LETTER TO THE NEWSLETTER READERS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS," signed by John W. Darr, Jr., which states in the opening paragraph that "The Greenwich Village Peace Center is now a year old."

Was the Greenwich Village Peace Center formed on or about October 1961?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

(Document marked "Darr Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you, Mr. Darr, participate in your activity as chairman of the Greenwich Village Peace Center as an individual under the discipline of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARR. I refuse an answer on the same grounds. Excuse me. There is a slight rewording of that statement, namely, that I would volunteer this information, but not answer this question, outside of this hearing room.

Mr. NITTLE. Well, we have had many witnesses who have volunteered statements outside of the hearing room when they are not under oath. I presume you will do it at that time, is that correct?

Mr. DARR. No. What I am saying is that I wouldn't answer this question even from my best friend. I don't think he has the right to ask it.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you participate in such activities as the formation of the Greenwich Village Peace Center in response to Communist directives?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer for the same ground.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer that question.

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer, sir, for the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. I have before me, Mr. Darr, the report and order of the Subversive Activities Control Board, a case decided February 7, 1956, in proceedings under the Internal Security Act of 1950, in the case of *Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States v. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.*

The order states that you have been identified as a member of the Communist Party while serving as a member of the board of directors of that organization, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., which was found to be a Communist-front organization and ordered to register as such with the Attorney General.

Were you a member of the Communist Party during the course of your service as a member of the board of directors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer that question.

Mr. DARR. I refuse to answer, sir, on the same ground.

Mr. NITTLE. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Governor?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions. Thank you.

Call your next witness, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, please.

Mr. DOYLE. Mrs. Wilson, would you please raise your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. WILSON. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you. Have a chair. Are you ready?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Proceed, Counsel.

TESTIMONY OF DAGMAR WILSON, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, LAWRENCE SPEISER

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your name and address for the record, please.

Mrs. WILSON. My name is Dagmar Wilson. I live at 1413 29th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. NITTLE. You are represented by counsel?

Mrs. WILSON. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Would counsel kindly identify himself, stating his name and office address.

Mr. SPEISER. Lawrence Speiser, offices at the American Civil Liberties Union, 1101 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, at the outset the committee wishes to make clear just why you have been subpoenaed to appear and testify in this hearing. I believe you understand that the committee is presently investigating Communist infiltration of peace groups in this country, with particular attention to Women Strike for Peace, an

organization of which, from published reports, you are the recognized leader. These hearings have also been particularly directed to the Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut section of Women Strike for Peace movement.

The committee has no evidence of Communist Party membership, or activity in support of front groups or of pro-Communist sympathies on your part, and this we wish to emphasize.

However, several of the witnesses who have already been heard by the committee and who have occupied leadership positions in the New York section of this movement have refused to divulge certain pertinent information about their organization, its formation, its leadership, and its activities.

The committee believes that you, as a leader of the movement and as a patriotic American citizen, will cooperate in this inquiry. I wish to make it clear that the committee is not interested in your beliefs or opinions and will not make inquiry into them. It is concerned only with factual information relative to the subject under inquiry.

With that introductory statement, would you please state the date and place of your birth?

As to the date of your birth, you may simply state that you are over 21 years of age, if you wish.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you. I don't mind telling you. I was born in 1916 in New York City.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate the extent of your formal education?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. I completed high school in London in 1934 and in the autumn of that year I went to the Slate School, which is the Art Department of London University. There I spent 4 years.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you the leader or coordinator of a movement known as Women Strike for Peace, which has its headquarters at 1822 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington 6, D.C.?

Mrs. WILSON. It is rather a hard question to answer. People like to call me leader. I regard it as more a term of endearment or, shall we say, an honorary title. I think I can best qualify it in this way.

It was as a result of my initiative that this grassroots movement sprang into being.

Mr. NITTLE. The *New York Times* of November 22, 1961, quoted you as follows: "I think it's about time I stop being head of this. We have many excellent volunteers. I just happened to be the starter."

Apparently at one time you did refer to yourself as being the head of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. I think we were all kind of groping for what to call me, largely because the press wanted an answer to this, and I have been given various titles such as coordinator, leader. We knew I wasn't the president. We didn't have an organization.

But I think I better just assume the honorary title, although I have no special function. We are really all leaders, you know.

Mr. NITTLE. And I am judging by what you say that the New York group would be under its own steam and the leaders of that group would not be controlled by you as the "head" of the national movement. Is that right?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, nobody is controlled by anybody in the Women Strike for Peace. We do have, however, communication with each other constantly, and I can explain how we do that later if you would like me to.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes. We shall probably go into that. What is presently the correct name of your movement? I ask that because it has been variously designated in published reports as Women Strike for Peace, Women for Peace, and Women's International Strike for Peace.

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. In one area they prefer to call themselves Women Stand for Peace, as a matter of fact. This again is most characteristic of the movement, that local groups have assumed names that they prefer. Some ladies don't like the idea of striking. It sounds a little too violent for them, so, all right, they can just be Women for Peace or Women Stand for Peace. Women's International——

Mr. NITTLE. Just a moment. You have indicated that some groups of women in the country apparently do not find the expression, "Women Strike for Peace," very agreeable?

Mrs. WILSON. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. In fact I believe you say they find it rather distasteful?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. However, "Women Strike for Peace" is the name which you originally applied to the movement?

Mrs. WILSON. No. You see, originally we started out just to perform one simple action. It was to be a demonstration at that time in support of the President's peace race, which he described at the United Nations, and we had to do something that was different from any other gestures of this kind that had been made, and it was groping for a new word. You know they had the sit-ins and the walks and the rides and everything else you could think of, and it took us quite a long time before this idea struck us, shall I say.

Mr. NITTLE. I take it then that the title of your movement, "Women Strike for Peace," was not your conception, but was a title suggested to you by someone else?

Mrs. WILSON. It was decided in a group of us who were discussing peace.

Mr. NITTLE. I think you might state whether you suggested the title "Women Strike for Peace," or whether it was suggested to you in that group.

Mrs. WILSON. It was suggested to me in that group, but I responded instantly.

Mr. NITTLE. So that "Women Strike for Peace" was the original name of the movement then at that point?

Mrs. WILSON. It was really a description of the action that we were planning to take on a certain day.

Mr. NITTLE. Is it now the name of the movement?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, it is generally accepted as the name of the movement.

Mr. NITTLE. Has the name of the movement been changed?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, in a sense it has. On January the 15th of this year we decided that we would try to communicate with peace groups in other countries. We succeeded in doing so and planned an international action. From that day on we decided we were "Women's International Strike for Peace." However, the titles of the movement in the other countries are completely different. I mean this is a very loose affiliation really.

Mr. NITTLE. You have, on or about January 15, changed the name to "Women's International Strike for Peace," is that right?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you a copy of Vol. 1, No. 1, of the Washington Newsletter, Women's International Strike for Peace. It is not dated.

Mrs. WILSON. Oh, dear.

Mr. NITTLE. And it appears as emanating from 1822 Massachusetts Avenue. On page 4 this statement in the paragraph on the top of the page appears:

"You'll recall that on *January 15*, Women Strike for Peace became 'WISP,'" which I assume is an abbreviation for Women's International Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. "Though it seems long ago, we think you'd like to know what happened * * *."

Now, it appears that this newsletter was issued at a time subsequent to January 15. Was the name "Women's International Strike for Peace" suggested to you by other persons?

Mrs. WILSON. No, I am afraid I just don't remember that. It is one of those things that came about so naturally and, of course, it is a beautiful word, you know, much better than "WSP."

(Document marked "Wilson Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Let me ask you this then. Do you recollect whether this new title for your organization was recommended to you by any member of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. No, it wasn't. I am pretty sure of that.

Mr. NITTLE. I ask that, Mrs. Wilson, because on January 11, 1962, January 12, 1962, and on January 14, 1962, there were various cablegrams addressed to an organization known as Women's International Strike for Peace and addressed to "WISP New York, New York."

They are cablegrams from various peace leaders from other countries. I have a list here. I don't think it is necessary to go down the list, but they appear from Australia, from India, and from Canada.

Now, our inquiry is, Why should these cablegrams be addressed to an organization whose name has not as yet been changed, but addressed to it in a subsequently changed name and addressed to New York?

Mrs. WILSON. You make it sound terribly dramatic.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me put it this way.

Mrs. WILSON. I'll answer it.

Mr. NITTLE. All right. Would you answer it?

Mrs. WILSON. The question is simply that we had a lady who was kind enough to volunteer to make the contact with the women in the other countries and she resided in New York, so that became a telegraphic address from then on.

Mr. NITTLE. Your international coordinator, as a matter of fact, is a lady who is on the New York Coordinating Committee, is she not?

Mrs. WILSON. I don't really know whether she is or not.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes. That is Mrs. [Ruth] Gage-Colby, isn't it?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, of course. You know her very well.

Mrs. WILSON. Sure.

Mr. NITTLE. And the chairman of the International Work Committee is Mrs. Gladys Blum, who is on the Central Coordinating Committee of the New York group; is that not correct?

Mrs. WILSON. I guess so. I don't know.

Mr. NITTLE. And I assume that since the lady you are speaking of is the international coordinator, that the international contacts had emanated from her connection with the New York group; is that right?

Mrs. WILSON. I don't think I quite understand that.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me put it this way. The international contacts then rest with the lady who is a member of the Metropolitan New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, I suppose so. She's in New York. Yes, she would be.

Mr. NITTLE. I would like to ask you at the beginning, Is it not a fact that you do not really exercise the effective leadership or control over the New York group?

Mrs. WILSON. I think I already explained that. I mean we all act on our own.

Mr. NITTLE. Has not the New York group played the dominant role in actions attributed to Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Heavens, I think the women in other cities would be mortified if I said that.

Mr. NITTLE. Was the picketing at the White House by Women Strike for Peace on January 15, 1962, your idea?

Mrs. WILSON. Oh, my goodness. My personal idea you mean?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mrs. WILSON. Well, it is very hard to recall, you know. When you discuss things in a group, ideas pop out from everybody at that time. When you come away, you all think it was your idea, you know.

Mr. NITTLE. I take it that you did not personally call for and initiate the organization of the January 15, 1962, demonstration?

Mrs. WILSON. I would like to think I did.

Mr. NITTLE. You would like to think you did?

Mrs. WILSON. I would like to think I did. Anyway, I am sure I had some part in it.

Mr. NITTLE. Now I want to refer to the picketing of the United Nations on February 20, 1962, which was for the announced purpose of protesting President Kennedy's decision to resume nuclear testing. Was that your idea?

Mrs. WILSON. I think we all demonstrated on that day. We were most disturbed.

Mr. NITTLE. What I mean to say is, Did you call for that particular demonstration and did you initiate it?

Mrs. WILSON. I am not quite sure about that specific one, but it would have worked in exactly the same way as all our other demonstrations did. One area would think of an idea for an action, shall we say, and will then communicate with other groups throughout the country, and in each city where they want to take this action they will do so. Now, in this city it was of course in front of the White House that we demonstrated. In New York it was in front of the United Nations.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know whether the idea in this particular instance originated from any member of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I am quite sure you know that this one originated spontaneously in many areas, because one of the things that we are violently against is nuclear testing.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, of course, Mrs. Wilson, I think you will agree that coordinated activities participated in by many people in many parts of the country on the same day do not occur "spontaneously." There must be a suggestion and some kind of communication.

Mrs. WILSON. Certainly, all communications.

Mr. NITTLE. I also want to refer to a very spectacular instance, and that was the sending of 51 delegates to the Geneva disarmament conference in April 1962. I would like to ask whether the idea for doing this was originally conceived by you.

Mrs. WILSON. No. Again, I wish I had thought of it.

Mr. NITTLE. Could you tell the committee, if you know, whether this idea originated from any member of the New York group?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I think this time it was really New York's baby and I think they should be proud of it.

Mr. NITTLE. Was this matter arranged, and were plans made for this trip to Geneva, by the New York organization?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. The plans were very complicated, because it did involve sending women from all over the country, as you know.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mrs. WILSON. And they were the ones that initiated the idea. I can explain that later on.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any discussions on this subject with Mrs. Blanche Posner?

Mrs. WILSON. No, I didn't.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any discussions on the Geneva arrangement with Iris Freed?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. NITTLE. I think she was in charge of sendoff publicity.

Mrs. WILSON. She may have been.

Mr. NITTLE. At any rate she wasn't appointed by you, is that right?

Mrs. WILSON. No, no, Lord no, not up in New York.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any discussions with Mrs. Lyla Hoffman about it?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. NITTLE. I want to hand you a copy of a document, previously marked for identification as Posner Exhibit No. 2, which is titled "Proposed Structure of Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, Connecticut." Did you have any part—

Mr. SPEISER. That isn't the title on this, Mr. Nittle.

Mr. NITTLE. This document is titled "Proposed Plan of Structure and Procedure for Women Strike for Peace New York New Jersey Connecticut."

Did you have any part in drawing up that proposed plan, Mrs. Wilson?

Mrs. WILSON. No, I can tell you I didn't, but it was over my dead body. New York was trying its best to get me to come up there, you know, and sort of settle their problems for them, and I discussed it with some of my friends down here and I said, "Look, those girls are having an awful time. There are so many of them they just don't seem to be able to get together." My friends said, "Don't baby them. They have to learn to grow up themselves."

Mr. NITTLE. You did not have any part in drawing it up?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Was the proposal ever submitted to you for your approval or commentary?

Mrs. WILSON. No. I mean this is completely against our principle.

Mr. NITTLE. I hand you Posner Exhibit No. 1, which is the actual structural plan adopted by, or utilized by, Women Strike for Peace, Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, Connecticut. Did you have any part in formulating that plan?

Mrs. WILSON. No. The reason I was reading this is because—well, I am sorry. That amused me very, very much. No, I had no part in this plan. I know exactly why it was done, though, and I would be glad to tell you about it.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any discussions with respect to that plan?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. With leaders of the New York group?

Mrs. WILSON. I don't know if you would call them leaders. I said we were all leaders so I guess they were leaders. Yes, we had lengthy telephone conversations and——

Mr. NITTLE. Telephone conversations only? You did not appear in New York?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, but I am not sure it was directly connected with this. It was a little bit, I guess, before they decided to make a structural plan. This has been one of our big problems, shall I say, in our own organization since the beginning.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any discussions with Blanche Posner, Iris Freed, or Lyla Hoffman with respect to that plan?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, not specifically with respect to that plan, no. We did discuss ways and means of doing things, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. I take it that in the New York discussions you had occasion to talk to Mrs. Posner, Mrs. Freed, and Mrs. Hoffman.

Mrs. WILSON. Not in the early days, no.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have occasion to discuss Posner Exhibit 1 with them?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Or any of them?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. NITTLE. The Communist newspaper, *The Worker*, of February 25, 1962, reported that you took part in and spoke at the Women Strike for Peace picketing of the United Nations headquarters in New York City on February 20, 1962. You did speak at the New York U.N. picketing on that date, did you not?

Mrs. WILSON. I prefer you to call it a demonstration. Picketing sounds so hostile. Yes, I spoke there.

Mr. NITTLE. That newspaper reported:

When Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, a Washington D.C. housewife who initiated this woman's movement for peace rose to speak there was silence. It was the first time Mrs. Wilson had participated in a New York peace action.

Was that journal correct in saying that this was the first time you had participated in any Women Strike for Peace action in New York?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, it was the first time I had participated in a public peace action.

Mr. NITTLE. Was your participation in that demonstration your own idea, or did you do that at the request of the New York group?

Mrs. WILSON. They kindly invited me, and I felt very pleased.

Mr. NITTLE. Prior to that February 20 demonstration, had you at any time consulted with the leadership of the New York group concerning the activities of Women Strike for Peace in that area?

Mrs. WILSON. Again I would like to qualify the word "leadership." We are all leaders. I had met with large numbers of ladies in New York before that, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Had you at any time, prior to February 20, at least exercised any direction or control of the activities of the New York group?

Mrs. WILSON. I think I already said that nobody controls anybody.

Mr. NITTLE. And since that time you have not directed or controlled any of the New York group's activity?

Mrs. WILSON. No, but cooperated; cooperated, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, Vol. I, No. 1, of the Washington Newsletter just shown you, which was issued from the address at 1822 Massachusetts Avenue, indicates that the headquarters of Women's International Strike for Peace is in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. WILSON. Is that what it says? "Headquarters"?

Mr. NITTLE. It does not say it specifically. I said that was the indication, so that I will ask you, Is 1822 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, the headquarters of Women's International Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, we have no headquarters. This office has a special function which I would be glad to explain.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes. Women's International Strike for Peace has no headquarters, you state.

Mrs. WILSON. Alas, no. We need one badly. There hasn't been anybody taking on the job so far.

Mr. NITTLE. That is a very interesting fact because I will hand you a magazine titled *New World Review*, dated October 1962. At page 37 an article appearing in that magazine, titled "Women Strike for Peace," by Helen Rand Miller, notes that the headquarters of Women's International Strike for Peace is 750 Third Avenue, New York City.

Mrs. WILSON. Very interesting.

Mr. NITTLE. Is 750 Third Avenue, New York City, the headquarters of Women's International Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. I sure wish it were.

(Document marked "Wilson Exhibit No. 2" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, I now hand you a copy of the Moscow-published *New Times*, No. 13, dated March 28, 1962, which declares that the Women's International Democratic Federation—an organization, by the way, which has been cited by this committee and other authorities as an international Communist front—was sponsoring a Women's World Assembly for Disarmament and that the Women's International Democratic Federation had established contact with "Women's Strike for Peace" in the United States for attendance at that Assembly. Do you have knowledge of any such contact being made with your organization prior to March 28, 1962, by the Moscow-based Women's International Democratic Federation?

Mrs. WILSON. I can't tell you exactly when we made contact with this group.

(Document marked "Wilson Exhibit No. 3" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Who is "we"?

Mrs. WILSON. "We"? Women. "Who is we?" I am one of them.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me put it this way, and be more specific. Did you personally make contact with the Women's International Democratic Federation on behalf of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. No, I think the initiative came from them. Oh, well, we probably contacted some of the members of the Women's whatever it is called, International Federation, in our attempt to affiliate with peace groups in other countries. That was described on January 15.

Mr. NITTLE. Whose idea was it to make contact with the Women's International Democratic Federation in Moscow to establish international contacts by Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. This isn't the way it was done. You see, we just contacted all the peace leaders that we could find in other countries, and I suppose this was among them, you see.

Mr. NITTLE. What I would like to know is, Who conceived the idea? Did this idea originate with the Washington headquarters, or with some other group?

Mrs. WILSON. This was all part of our attempt to make Women Strike for Peace into WISP, you see, and—

Mr. NITTLE. An idea which I believe you stated originated with the New York headquarters through its international coordinator?

Mrs. WILSON. I did not. I said nothing of the sort. I said I wish I had thought of it.

Mr. NITTLE. You indicated that it wasn't your idea.

Mrs. WILSON. I think many of us had the idea of making this into an international movement. I know I certainly had personally.

Mr. NITTLE. I am not referring generally to, or talking generally about, an international movement. I am referring to a specific contact with an organization. I want to know whose idea it was to make that contact.

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I am afraid it is impossible—

Mr. NITTLE. Was this your idea, or was it suggested to you?

Mrs. WILSON. You are trying to pin it down to one thing. We made contact at the same time, about the same time, with as many peace groups in the other countries as we could find.

Mr. NITTLE. You say "we." I don't understand that.

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, we. This was on our behalf.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you?

Mrs. WILSON. No, I did not personally. Maybe it was referred to our international coordinator. She was then called—she did it on behalf of—

Mr. NITTLE. Let's take our time. The international coordinator. Are you referring to the person who is international coordinator for the New York group?

Mrs. WILSON. She is international coordinator for the national movement. She happens to reside in New York.

Mr. NITTLE. And is a member of, or affiliated with, the New York group?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, sure, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes; we are all affiliated with each other, yes. Would you be interested, by the way, in knowing why she was selected to do this?

Mr. NITTLE. I am just interested in determining—

Mrs. WILSON. You see, it really came from California. That's the funny part about it.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, I hand you a copy of the *Moscow News* of June 30, 1962, a weekly publication which emanates from Gorky Street, Moscow, published in the English language. I direct your attention to page 7, an article titled "Delegations from Over a Hundred Countries to Attend Moscow Congress" which reports that the American Women Strike for Peace decided to send representatives and observers to the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace. It was to be held in Moscow commencing July 9, 1962.

I would like to know whether you participated in the decision, if one was made by American Women Strike for Peace, to send representatives and observers to the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, I did.

(Document marked "Wilson Exhibit No. 4" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. NITTLE. Did you originally conceive this idea, or was it a suggestion from some other source?

Mrs. WILSON. This is an idea I have always had myself. Others have had it, too, that it would be very important for Women Strike for Peace to participate in as many international peace conferences as we possibly could.

Mr. NITTLE. Newspaper accounts indicate that the first national demonstration was held November 1, 1961, by Women Strike for Peace in 58 cities and that about 2,000 women marched at the United Nations. Did you coordinate the action for demonstrations in 58 cities?

Mrs. WILSON. Is this something that—

Mr. NITTLE. I ask you to answer that yes or no.

Mrs. WILSON. That I find very hard to explain to the masculine mind. I can't answer that yes or no. It was my initiative that resulted in, yes, all of these demonstrations that took place on that day. By the way, there were 60, not just 58.

Mr. DOYLE. I think the masculine mind can understand that.

Mrs. WILSON. I thought that you would be able to, Mr. Doyle, because I have been watching your face.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, Mrs. Wilson, the *People's World*, the West Coast Communist Party newspaper, the issue of September 15, 1962, reported—and I am quoting this because I assume you don't read the *People's World*—

Mrs. WILSON. Oh, you do?

Mr. NITTLE. The report said:

A grass roots, votes-for-peace activity by many hundreds of women in Pacific Coast states has added a new dimension to congressional and state election campaigns, which go into high gear in the remaining seven weeks before Nov. 6.

I would like to ask whether this political activity was conceived at your Washington office of Women Strike for Peace, or by some other group.

Mrs. WILSON. I think this was our baby, I am proud to say, yes. You know, this was a national campaign, by the way. I mean it wasn't just local.

Mr. NITTLE. That article in the *People's World*, at page 2, entitled, "Women busy in elections. It's politics for peace," which appeared under the byline of Peggy Dennis, widow of the late Eugene Dennis, who, until his death in January 1961, was general secretary of the United States Communist Party, also stated, in part:

At their first national conference last June at Ann Arbor, Mich., Women for Peace (in some cities called Women's Strike for Peace, also Women's Intl. Strike for Peace) discussed at some length the question of political action.

Did you attend the national conference last June at Ann Arbor?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. NITTLE. Who made the decision to hold the conference at Ann Arbor, rather than in Washington?

Mrs. WILSON. This was Ann Arbor's idea, so they invited us.

Mr. NITTLE. I see. So that the political conference then was called at the request of the Ann Arbor group and it was their idea?

Mrs. WILSON. This wasn't a political conference. In fact, I am not even sure this particular thing was discussed there, but many things were discussed and this may well have been one of them, yes. Yes; "Come to the WISPUREE." That is what we called it.

Mr. NITTLE. During the past 2 days, Mrs. Wilson, the following persons from the Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, Connecticut Women Strike for Peace have testified before the committee: Blanche Posner, Ruth Meyers, Lyla Hoffman, Iris Freed, and Anna Mackenzie.

Have you at any time consulted with them with the view toward directing what activities the New York group of Women Strike for Peace would undertake?

Mrs. WILSON. Have constant communication of these activities, you know.

Mr. NITTLE. Have you exercised any direction or control?

Mrs. WILSON. Never any direction or control, only suggestions. These suggestions, you know, shuttle back and forth across the country all the time.

Mr. NITTLE. It is the committee's information that a Selma Rein has participated, in the past, in the activities of the Washington group of Women Strike for Peace. Do you know Selma Rein? That is S-e-l-m-a R-e-i-n?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I will tell you something. I don't think that you can really expect me to name names or women who have participated in the Women Strike for Peace.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, Mrs. Wilson, I, of course, have named some names, and you have responded affirmatively or otherwise with respect to those names of women who are active in Women Strike for Peace, and I am frankly a little surprised that you pause while I ask you about the activities of Selma Rein in the Washington group of Women Strike for Peace.

It is the committee's information that Mrs. Rein has had possession of a key to the Washington office of Women Strike for Peace, and it is also the committee's information that in March 1962 Mrs. Selma

Rein was appointed as a member of a committee of four to arrange a list of international contacts to be made by Women Strike for Peace, that she was placed upon this group of four——

Mrs. WILSON. Wait a minute. I have lost track.

Mr. NITTLE. All right. Let me put it this way. I stated that it is the committee's information also that in March 1962 Mrs. Selma Rein was appointed as a member of a committee of four to arrange a list of international contacts to be made by Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. WILSON. She couldn't have been so because nobody was ever appointed.

Mr. NITTLE. Just a moment.

Mrs. WILSON. Excuse me.

Mr. NITTLE. Included within the group of four was the international coordinator of the New York group of Women Strike for Peace. I want to inquire, if you will respond to the question, whether Mrs. Rein was appointed to a committee to arrange a list of international contacts to be made by Women Strike for Peace.

Mrs. WILSON. Nobody has ever been appointed by anyone, you see, in our movement.

Mr. NITTLE. I think it is important to make this inquiry because I spoke to you a moment ago of an article which appeared in the March 28 issue of a Moscow publication anticipating the contact with Women Strike for Peace, or stating that one had been made.

That particular article, to refer back to it and to refresh your recollection, was the Moscow-published *New Times*, dated March 28, 1962, which declared that the Women's International Democratic Federation, that is, a Moscow international front, was sponsoring the Women's World Assembly for Disarmament, and the article stated that the Women's International Democratic Federation had established contact with Women Strike for Peace for attendance at that Assembly. Indeed, you also testified in response to questions relating to that, that this was the idea of your Washington group. Therefore, I am inquiring whether Mrs. Selma Rein, who is a resident of Washington and who appears to have been active at your Washington headquarters, was, in fact, appointed in the Washington headquarters as a member of a committee to arrange international contacts.

Mrs. WILSON. Well, you have asked me so many things in one there. First, there was an invitation I gather? I received an invitation at my house. I presume that one was also sent to our Washington office. I might explain that the Washington office is manned by volunteers, who take it in turns to come in and out of that office with their typewriters, a few hours in the afternoon, or one day a week, or however it happens to fit into their schedules, and so on, so it is quite possible that there was a duplicate at the office. I know nothing about any one individual's connection with this thing whatever.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me ask you this, Mrs. Wilson. Do you know whether or not Mrs. Selma Rein established contact on behalf of your group with the Women's International Democratic Federation in Moscow?

Mrs. WILSON. I can say emphatically that she could not have done so.

Mr. NITTLE. What makes you say that she could not have done so?

Mrs. WILSON. Because the contact had already been made way back when we started to become international, if you know what I mean. The contact has been there ever since and it continues.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you have knowledge of the circumstances under which Mrs. Selma Rein was appointed in March of 1962 as a member of a committee of four of the Washington group of Women Strike for Peace to arrange a list of international contacts?

Mrs. WILSON. No one has ever been appointed to anything in Women Strike for Peace. People do volunteer for this or that job.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, to your knowledge did Mrs. Selma Rein volunteer for that particular job?

Mrs. WILSON. I have no knowledge of this, no.

Mr. NITTLE. Did she, to your knowledge, serve upon a committee with the international coordinator of Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. I don't know.

Mr. NITTLE. You don't know?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, in putting this question I don't assume that you do have knowledge, but I would like to ask whether, in fact, you have knowledge that Mrs. Selma Rein has been identified as a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. WILSON. I have no such knowledge.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, for the record I think it important to note that the Committee on Un-American Activities received the sworn testimony on December 13, 1955, of Herbert Fuchs, who, from 1937 until 1948 and while a member of the Communist Party, was employed as an attorney by the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D.C., with the exception of a 3-year period when he was assigned to the National War Labor Board.

For a considerable period of time Mr. Fuchs served as the official contact for a Communist cell group within the National Labor Relations Board with higher Communist Party echelons in Washington, D.C. Mr. Fuchs' contact was Victor Perlo, whose leading role in the Communist Party program to infiltrate the U.S. Government was first revealed in the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley before this committee in 1948. Mr. Fuchs testified that in 1946 Selma Rein was a member of a Communist Party group with which he met. Mrs. Selma Rein was subpoenaed to appear before this committee on February 28, 1956, and given an opportunity to explain or deny her alleged membership in the Communist Party. She refused to answer that question, invoking the fifth amendment privilege.

To the best of your recollection, Mrs. Wilson, did Mrs. Rein during the period of her activity in the Washington office ever make any suggestions to you as to any activities which Women Strike for Peace might undertake?

Mrs. WILSON. No, sir.

Mr. NITTLE. Literature of Women Strike for Peace, with place of origin noted thereon as 1822 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., dated December 6, 1962, and addressed to "Dear WISPs," indicates that your organization sent many telegrams containing the following message:

Urge contact all WISPs to wire Chairman Walter, House Unamerican Activities Committee asking opportunity to testify with Dagmar and other WISPs December 11-13 in Washington about wonderful work WSP doing to preserve

world peace. Airmail copy telegram to Washington office for use at hearings. Plan to come regardless of his answer. Hospitality provided for you and children. Letter following.

Then I believe in the letter you have urged the women to come with their babies.

I am quite sure, Mrs. Wilson, it will please you to know that in response to your telegram Mr. Walter has received a large number of telegrams and letters—

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, I know.

Mr. NITTLE. —protesting the committee hearings. I might add, incidentally, that this is a further indication that, despite the claims of Women Strike for Peace, they are pretty well “organized.”

Mrs. WILSON. Well, they are here to tell. I mean here you see them.

Mr. NITTLE. However, one thing that impresses the committee is the fact that a considerable number of these communications have come from persons who have been publicly identified in testimony before this committee and other agencies as members of the Communist Party. Was the list of persons to whom your telegram was to be sent prepared, in part or in whole, by the New York office of the—

Mrs. WILSON. No, it wasn't. This one was prepared by us.

Mr. NITTLE. —Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. No. It was prepared by us. I was there. Incidentally, I think it is very brave of these women if they had been here before to offer to come and testify again.

Mr. NITTLE. I am about to conclude the staff interrogation, with the permission of the Chair, and I would like to pose a few remaining questions in concluding. I think you have observed during the course of your attendance at these hearings that numerous Communist directives, and evidence produced in these hearings, indicate that a present major objective of the Communist Party is the infiltration of peace groups. I would like to ask whether you would knowingly permit or encourage a Communist Party member to occupy a leadership position in Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, my dear sir, I have absolutely no way of controlling, do not desire to control, who wishes to join in the demonstrations and the efforts that the women strikers have made for peace.

In fact I would also like to go even further. I would like to say that unless everybody in the whole world joins us in this fight, then God help us.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you knowingly permit or welcome Nazis or Fascists to occupy leadership positions in Women Strike for Peace?

Mrs. WILSON. Whether we could get them or not, I don't think we could.¹

Mr. NITTLE. Am I correct, then, in assuming that you plan to take no action designed to prevent Communists from assuming positions of leadership in the movement or to eliminate Communists who may have already obtained such positions?

Mrs. WILSON. Certainly not.

Mr. NITTLE. The staff has no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Governor?

¹ Despite the fact that this is the response recorded by the official reporter for the hearings, newspapermen covering the hearings reported—and members of the committee and its staff distinctly recall—that Mrs. Wilson's actual reply to the preceding question was: “If only we could get them on our side.”

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Bruce?

Mr. BRUCE. No questions at all.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions. I want to thank you on behalf of the committee and the U.S. Congress for appearing and being so helpful to us. I want to emphasize that the committee recognizes that there are many, many, many women, in fact a great, great majority of women, in this peace movement who are absolutely patriotic and absolutely adverse to everything the Communist Party stands for.

We recognize that you are one of them. We compliment you on your leadership and on your helpfulness to us this morning.

Mr. NITTLE, is that all?

Mrs. WILSON. I do hope that you live to thank us when we have achieved our goal.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, we will.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further witnesses at this time.

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:28 p.m., Thursday, December 13, 1962, the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

A

| | Page |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Abrams, Henry----- | 2049, 2052, 2053, 2056, 2057, 2088, 2128, 2129, 2135, 2161, 2162, 2180 |
| Abzug, Bella----- | 2078 |
| Amter, Israel (alias: Ford)----- | 2136, 2137 |

B

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Bentley, Elizabeth Terrill (aliases: Helen; Mary; Helen Johns; Helen Johnson; Helen Grant)----- | 2199 |
| Bethe, Hans A----- | 2089 |
| Blum, Gladys----- | 2078 |
| Boudin, Leonard B----- | 2093 |
| Boulding, Elsie----- | 2089 |
| Brancato, Erasmus L. (Ed)----- | 2163 |
| Brancato, Jean (Jeanne) (Mrs. Erasmus L. Brancato)----- | 2056, 2163-2166 (testimony), 2168 |
| Brower, Michael----- | 2089 |
| Brownell, Herbert, Jr----- | 2058, 2187 |

C

| | |
|--|--|
| Chesman, Miriam (Mrs. Leon Chesman)---- | 2056, 2057, 2166-2176 (testimony) |
| Clark, Tom C----- | 2130 |
| Clinton, Rose (formerly Rose Shakewitz)----- | 2052, 2053, 2056, 2126-2131 (testimony), 2135, 2162 |
| Colby, Ruth Gage. (See Gage-Colby, Ruth.) | |
| Contente, Ira----- | 2121 |
| Contente, Sylvia (Mrs. Ira Contente)----- | 2051, 2052, 2118-2123 (testimony) |

D

| | |
|--|---|
| Darr, John W., Jr----- | 2049, 2058, 2088, 2182-2187 (testimony) |
| Davidow, Mike----- | 2103 |
| Davis, Benjamin J., Jr----- | 2056, 2165 |
| Dean of Canterbury (See Johnson, Hewlett) | |
| Delecorte, Valerie----- | 2078 |
| Dennis, Eugene (born Francis Xavier Waldron; also known as Paul Eugene Walsh; Milton)----- | 2061, 2197 |
| Dennis, Peggy (Mrs. Eugene Dennis)----- | 2061, 2197 |
| Dolkart, Mrs. Ralph----- | 2089 |
| Dubois, W. E. B. (William Edward Burghardt)----- | 2155 |

E

| | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Eisenhower, Dwight D----- | 2070 |
|---------------------------|------|

F

| | |
|--|--|
| Farber, Gladys----- | 2089 |
| Flink, Richard A----- | 2047, 2048, 2061, 2068-2073 (testimony) |
| Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley----- | 2136, 2165, 2172, 2173 |
| Fodor, Folly----- | 2090 |
| Ford, James W----- | 2136 |
| Freed, Iris (Mrs. Selwyn Freed; nee Schwartz)----- | 2053, 2061, 2132-2138 (testimony), 2192, 2193, 2197 |
| Fuchs, Herbert (also known as Herbert Hacker)----- | 2199 |
| Funn, Dorothy K. (See Swan, Dorothy.) | |

| | G | Page |
|---|--|------|
| Gage-Colby, Ruth | 2078, 2141, | 2190 |
| Garst, Eleanor | | 2143 |
| Gerson, Simon W | | 2101 |
| Gibor, Lynn | | 2078 |
| Gordon, Lorraine | | 2078 |
| Gross, Ceil | 2055, 2129, 2158–2162 (testimony) | |
| | H | |
| Hall, Gus (alias for Arva Halberg) | 2065, | 2181 |
| Herring, Frances | | 2141 |
| Hoffman, Lyla | 2050, 2051, 2053, 2061, | |
| | 2103–2114 (testimony), 2130, 2131, 2140, 2192, 2193, 2197 | |
| Huberman, Leo | | 2083 |
| | J | |
| Johnson, Hewlett (Dean of Canterbury; a/k/a “Red” Dean of Canterbury) | | 2157 |
| | K | |
| Kennedy, John F | 2070, | 2141 |
| Khrushchev, Nikita S | 2065, 2069, | 2141 |
| Krumbein, Charles | | 2137 |
| | L | |
| Landis, Lily | | 2078 |
| Lattimore, Owen (J.) | | 2174 |
| Lenin, V. I. | | 2065 |
| Leventhal, Natalie | | 2078 |
| Levine, Jack | | 2091 |
| | M | |
| Mackenzie, Anna (Mrs. Cameron Mackenzie; nee DeCormis) | 2054, | |
| | 2061, 2138–2151 (testimony), | 2197 |
| Markward, Mary Stalcup | 2053, | 2129 |
| Mauro, Alex | | 2131 |
| McAvoy, Clifford T | | 2172 |
| Melman, Clarice | | 2090 |
| Merton, Thomas | | 2089 |
| Meyers, Ruth (S.) (Mrs. William Meyers) | 2050, | |
| | 2061, 2093–2103 (testimony), 2171, | 2197 |
| Miller, Betty | | 2135 |
| Miller, Doris K | | 2131 |
| Miller, Helen Rand | | 2194 |
| Mishukov, Yuri A | 2048, 2049, 2068– | 2071 |
| Molli, Jeanne | | 2085 |
| Moos, Elizabeth | 2054, 2055, 2152–2158 (testimony) | |
| | N | |
| Neidenberg, Elsie (Mrs. Louis Neidenberg) | 2051, 2114–2118 (testimony) | |
| North, Joseph | | 2157 |
| | O | |
| Obrinsky, William | 2057, 2058, 2178–2182 (testimony) | |
| Ohrenstein, Manfred | | 2131 |
| | P | |
| Pauling, Linus (Carl) | 2053, 2055, 2135, 2160, | 2179 |
| Perlo, Victor (also known as “Mike”; Martin Stribling) | | 2199 |
| Philbrick, Herbert Arthur | 2055, | 2157 |
| Polshek, Ellyn | | 2142 |
| Posner, Blanche (Mrs. Max Posner; nee Hofrichter) | 2049, | |
| | 2053, 2060, 2061, 2073–2093 (testimony), 2095, 2130, 2134, | |
| | 2136, 2140, 2192, 2193, 2197. | |

| R | Page |
|---|-----------------------|
| Rabinowitz, Victor | 2073 |
| "Red" Dean of Canterbury. (<i>See</i> Johnson, Hewlett.) | |
| Rein, Selma Rice (Mrs. David Rein) | 2061, 2062, 2197-2199 |
| Remington, William Walter | 2055, 2157 |
| Rosenwald, Dorothy Monet | 2083, 2084 |
| Ross, Paul L. | 2178 |
| Roth, Mildred | 2093 |

S

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| Sharmat, Mary | 2131 |
| Sorum, William | 2057, 2058, 2180 |
| Spector, Norma | 2093 |
| Speiser, Lawrence | 2182, 2187 |
| Stalin, Josef | 2174 |
| Stevenson (Adlai E.) | 2070 |
| Stone, I. F. | 2089 |
| Swan, Dorothy Kelsoc Funn | 2053, 2130 |
| Szilard, Leo | 2089 |

T

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Taylor, Telford | 2103, 2114, 2118, 2126, 2132, 2138, 2152, 2158, 2163, 2166 |
| Thompson, Robert | 2052, 2121, 2170 |

V

| | |
|-----------------------|------|
| Vosk, Jeannette | 2078 |
|-----------------------|------|

W

| | |
|--|-------|
| Warren, Alvin | 2157 |
| Weik, Mary H. | 2089 |
| Wilson, Dagmar (Mrs. Christopher Bernard Wilson; nee Saersching) | 2050, |
| 2051, 2059, 2062, 2079, 2084, 2086, 2097-2100, 2105, 2108, 2109, | |
| 2141, 2187-2201 (testimony). | |

Z

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Zaitsev, Yuri V. | 2048, 2049, 2068, 2071 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|

ORGANIZATIONS

A

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Abraham Lincoln Brigade. (<i>See</i> International Brigade, Fifteenth.) | |
| Advance Publishing Co. | 2159 |
| American Association for the United Nations, Bronx chapter | 2119 |
| American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) | 2183, 2187 |
| American Continental Congress for Peace | 2054, 2055, 2155 |
| American Labor Party | 2172 |
| American Russian Institute (for Cultural Relations with the Soviet Union), San Francisco | 2055, 2156 |
| American Student Union | 2149-2151 |
| American Youth for Democracy | 2052, 2122 |

B

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Bronx River Neighborhood Center | 2119 |
|---------------------------------------|------|

C

| | |
|--|------|
| Cafeteria Workers Union, CIO | 2130 |
| Carnegie (Endowment) International Center ¹ | 2090 |
| Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (New York City) (Fund for the Republic) | 2090 |
| Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE). (<i>See</i> National Commit- tee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.) | |
| Committee on Radiation in Food | 2089 |

¹ Appears as Centre.

Communist Party of the United States of America:

| | |
|---|------------------|
| National Structure: | |
| National Commissions: | Page |
| Education Commission (or Department) | 2064, 2181 |
| National Committee | 2065, 2181 |
| States and Territories: | |
| Louisiana: | |
| State Committee | 2057, 2180 |
| New Orleans: | |
| Professional Branch | 2057, 2058, 2180 |
| New York State: | |
| New York City Area | 2137 |
| Bronx County: | |
| DeWitt Clinton High School fraction | 2049, 2084 |
| Westchester County: | |
| County Convention, January 1957 | 2054, 2137 |
| Yonkers: | |
| Carpet Shop branch | 2054, 2137 |
| Communist Political Association (May 1944 to July 1945) | 2146 |
| Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups | 2052, |
| 2053, 2055, 2088, 2089, 2129, 2135, 2159-2161 | |
| 100 Days for Peace Committee | 2160, 2161 |
| Conference of the 17-Nation Committee on Disarmament: | |
| 60th Plenary Session, March 14-June 15, 1962 (Geneva, Switzerland) .. | 2050, |
| 2052, 2054, 2060, 2089, 2098, 2104, 2121, 2123, 2140-2144, 2192 | |
| Congress of American Women | 2153 |

D

| | |
|--|------------|
| Department Store Union (Independent) | 2135 |
| DeWitt Clinton High School (New York City) | 2049, 2084 |

F

| | |
|--|------|
| Fellowship of Reconciliation | 2089 |
| Friends Service Committee. (<i>See</i> Religious Society of Friends, American Friends Service Committee.) | |

G

| | |
|--|--|
| Geneva Disarmament Conference, 1962. (<i>See</i> Conference of the 17 Nation Committee on Disarmament, 60th Plenary Session.) | |
| Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. (<i>See</i> entry under National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.) | |
| Greenwich Village Peace Center | 2049, 2058, 2088, ¹ 2090, 2185, 2186, |

H

| | |
|---|------------|
| Hessian Hills School (Croton, N.Y.) | 2156, 2157 |
|---|------------|

I

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Institute for International Order | 2089 |
| Institute of Pacific Relations | 2057, 2173, 2174 |
| International Brigade, Fifteenth (also referred to as Abraham Lincoln Brigade) | 2157 |

M

| | |
|----------------------------|------|
| Monthly Review Press | 2089 |
|----------------------------|------|

N

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) .. | 2155 |
| National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) | 2052 |
| 2057, 2072, 2088, 2118, 2128, 2179 | |
| Greater New York Committee | 2052, 2128, 2179, 2180 |
| Staten Island Committee | 2057, 2058, 2179-2181 |

¹ Appears as Centre.

INDEX

v

| | Page |
|---|------------|
| National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc..... | 2058, 2187 |
| National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). (See entry under United States Government.) | |
| National Negro Congress..... | 2130 |
| National War Labor Board. (See entry under United States Government.) | |
| New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. (See National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Greater New York Committee.) | |

O

One Hundred Days for Peace Committee. (See entry under Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups.)

P

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Peace Information Center..... | 2054, 2153-2155 |
| Pennies for Peace, Inc..... | 2089 |
| People's Rights Party..... | 2165, 2172 |

R

| | |
|---|------|
| Religious Society of Friends: | |
| American Friends Service Committee..... | 2089 |

S

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Scientists' Committee for Radiation Information..... | 2131 |
| Staten Island Community Peace Group..... | 2057, 2058, 2179-2181 |
| Stockholm Peace Appeal (or Petition). (See World Peace Appeal.) | |

U

| | |
|--|------------------|
| United Nations: | |
| Office of Conference Services..... | 2070 |
| United States Government: | |
| National Labor Relations Board (NLRB)..... | 2199 |
| National War Labor Board..... | 2199 |
| Senate, United States: | |
| Judiciary Committee..... | 2057, 2173, 2174 |
| Subversive Activities Control Board..... | 2058 |

W

| | |
|--|---|
| West Side Peace Committee (New York City)..... | 2052, 2053, 2056, 2127-2131, 2159-2162 |
| Women for Peace. (See Women's International Strike for Peace.) | |
| Women Strike for Peace (also known as Women for Peace, Women Stand for Peace; on January 15, 1962 the name was changed to Women's International Strike for Peace (p. 2189); See entries under Women's International Strike for Peace.) | |
| Women's Direct Action Committee..... | 2090 |
| Women's International Democratic Federation..... | 2060, 2061, 2194, 2195, 2198 |
| World Assembly for Disarmament, March 23-25, 1962, (Vienna, Austria)..... | 2060, 2194, 2198 |
| Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.... | 2054, 2089, 2152, 2153 |
| Women's International Strike for Peace (formerly known as Women Strike for Peace, Women for Peace, Women Stand for Peace)..... | 2047, 2052, 2059-2062, 2083, 2084, 2094, 2098-2100, 2104, 2105, 2116, 2123, 2135, 2140-2149, 2169, 2170, 2176, 2187-2201. |
| First National Conference, June, 1962 (Ann Arbor, Mich.)..... | 2060, 2061, 2197 |
| California: | |
| Los Angeles..... | 2090 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Women's International Strike for Peace—Continued | Page |
| Metropolitan New York, New Jersey, Connecticut Area..... | 2047-2066, 2072, 2074-2178, 2188-2200 |
| Structure: | |
| Central Coordinating Committee..... | 2050, 2053, 2056, 2059, 2076, 2077, 2081, 2082, 2096, 2104, 2106, 2108, 2133, 2140, 2163-2165, 2167, 2168, 2170, 2190, 2191. |
| General Assembly..... | 2077, 2164, 2165, 2168 |
| Work Committees: | |
| Action Committee..... | 2078 |
| Finance Committee..... | 2078, 2081, 2115, 2116 |
| Graphic and Visual Committee..... | 2078, 2081 |
| International Committee..... | 2059, 2078, 2082, 2191 |
| Legislative Committee..... | 2078, 2082 |
| Literature and Education Committee..... | 2078, 2081 |
| National Liaison Committee..... | 2078, 2082 |
| Office Committee (Secretarial Committee)..... | 2049, 2075, 2078, 2079, 2081, 2091, 2095 |
| Press and Public Relations Committee..... | 2078, 2081 |
| Radiation Committee..... | 2078 |
| Bronx group..... | 2056, 2163 |
| East Bronx group..... | 2167-2169 |
| Connecticut group..... | 2139 |
| Nassau County, N.Y..... | 2050, 2104, 2105, 2108, 2109 |
| Great Neck group..... | 2050, 2051, 2105-2108 |
| Long Island group (also known as Women for Peace)..... | 2096, 2102, 2104 |
| Westchester County, N.Y. (Westchester Women for Peace)..... | 2053, 2133, 2134, 2136 |
| Michigan: | |
| Ann Arbor group..... | 2060, 2197 |
| Washington, D.C. group..... | 2061 |
| Women's World Assembly for Disarmament. (See entry under Women's International Democratic Federation.) | |
| World Peace Appeal (also known as the Stockholm Peace Appeal or Petition)..... | 2054, 2153, 2154 |
| World Peace Congress (also known as World Congress of Partisans of Peace and World Congress of Defenders of Peace): | |
| First Congress, April 20-24, 1949 (Paris, France)..... | 2054, 2155 |
| Stockholm Conference of the Permanent Committee, March 1950 (Sweden)..... | 2054, 2153 |
| World Peace Council (also known as World Council of Peace)..... | 2064 |
| World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, July 9-14, 1962 (Moscow, Russia)..... | 2196 |
| Y | |
| Young Communist League, USA..... | 2052, 2122, 2150 |

PUBLICATIONS

| | |
|--|------------|
| A | |
| Are We on the Road to War..... | 2089 |
| B | |
| Bibliography..... | 2088-2090 |
| Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists..... | 2089 |
| E | |
| Evaluation of January 15th Demonstration..... | 2089 |
| G | |
| Grand Illusion (anti-war film)..... | 2057, 2179 |
| I | |
| I. F. Stone's Weekly..... | 2089 |
| L | |
| Large Soviet Encyclopedia (Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya) | 2064 |

M

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Milk Fact Sheet Plus Question & Answer Pamphlet..... | 2089 |

P

| | |
|--|------------|
| Peace Monthly..... | 2088, 2089 |
| Peacegram (publication of Peace Information Center, N.Y.C.)..... | 2154 |
| Problems of Disarmament..... | 2089 |

S

| | |
|--|------------|
| Sane World (leaflet)..... | 2089 |
| Small Soviet Encyclopedia (Malaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya)..... | 2064 |
| Statement issued by the Conference of Representatives of 81 Communist Parties, Moscow, December 1960..... | 2065 |
| Student Advocate (official organ of American Student Union)..... | 2150, 2151 |

T

| | |
|----------------------------|------|
| Ten Minutes for Peace..... | 2089 |
|----------------------------|------|

V

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Vassar Miscellany News..... | 2149, 2150 |
|-----------------------------|------------|

W

| | |
|---|------|
| War Peace Report..... | 2089 |
| We Pledge Peace, A Friendship Book..... | 2156 |
| Window on the World..... | 2089 |
| Women's Peace Movement Bulletin..... | 2089 |



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3123

